

# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

December, 1948

G. P. SHANNON. <i>Against Marot as a Source of Marlowe's 'Hero and Leander'</i> . . . . .	387
ALBERTA TURNER. <i>Another Seventeenth-Century Anglo-Saxon Poem</i> . . . . .	389
E. L. MARILLA. <i>The Secular and Religious Poetry of Henry Vaughan</i> . . . . .	394
WILLIAM ELTON. <i>'Paradise Lost' and the Digby 'Mary Magdalene'</i> . . . . .	412
FRANCESCO CORDASCO. <i>Smollett and Petronius</i> . . . . .	415
STEWART C. WILCOX. <i>Hazlitt's Aphorisms</i> . . . . .	418
JAMES THORPE. <i>Keats's 'Hymn to Pan' and the Litany</i> . . . . .	424
HOOVER H. JORDAN. <i>Byron and Moore</i> . . . . .	429
THOMAS A. PERRY. <i>Emerson, the Historical Frame, and Shakespeare</i> . . . . .	440
CARROLL E. REED and LESTER W. SEIFERT. <i>A Study of the Pennsylvania German Dialect Spoken in the Counties of Lehigh and Berks</i> . . . . .	448
WALTER A. REICHART. <i>The Genesis of Hauptmann's Iphigenia Cycle</i> . . . . .	467
LEO SPITZER. <i>Patterns of Thought in the Style of Albert Thibaudet (Part II)</i> . . . . .	478
EDWARD D. SULLIVAN. <i>Molière's Interpretation of Molière's Misanthrope</i> . . . . .	492
REVIEWS . . . . .	497
BOOKS RECEIVED . . . . .	510

Volume Nine

Number Four

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS  
SEATTLE

# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Edited by

EDWARD GODFREY COX

*Managing Editor*

DUDLEY D. GRIFFITH

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

GEORGE W. UMPHREY

*Direct Contributions and Business Correspondence to*

Managing Editor, Modern Language Quarterly

Parrington Hall

University of Washington

Seattle 5

Subscription price \$2.00 per year • Single copies \$0.75

Issued in March, June, September, December

Entered as second-class matter May 6, 1940, at the post office at Seattle, Washington,  
under the Act of March 3, 1879

PRINTED IN U. S. A.







# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Volume Nine

December, 1948

Number Four

## ARTICLES

- G. P. Shannon. Against Marot as a Source of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* . . . . . 387
- Alberta Turner. Another Seventeenth-Century Anglo-Saxon Poem . . . . . 389
- E. L. Marilla. The Secular and Religious Poetry of Henry Vaughan . . . . . 394
- William Elton. *Paradise Lost* and the Digby *Mary Magdalene* . 412
- Francesco Cordasco. Smollett and Petronius . . . . . 415
- Stewart C. Wilcox. Hazlitt's Aphorisms . . . . . 418
- James Thorpe. Keats's "Hymn to Pan" and the Litany . . . 424
- Hoover H. Jordan. Byron and Moore . . . . . 429
- Thomas A. Perry. Emerson, the Historical Frame, and Shakespeare . . . . . 440
- Carroll E. Reed and Lester W. Seifert. A Study of the Pennsylvania German Dialect Spoken in the Counties of Lehigh and Berks . . . . . 448
- Walter A. Reichart. The Genesis of Hauptmann's *Iphigenia Cycle* . . . . . 467
- Leo Spitzer. Patterns of Thought in the Style of Albert Thibaudet (Part II) . . . . . 478
- Edward D. Sullivan. Molé's Interpretation of Molière's *Misanthrope* . . . . . 492

## REVIEWS

Mary Patchell. The Palmerin Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction [ <i>Francis Lee Utley</i> ]	497
E. M. W. Tillyard. Shakespeare's History Plays [ <i>Virgil K. Whitaker</i> ]	498
Donald M. Foerster. Homer in English Criticism [ <i>Hoyt Trowbridge</i> ]	501
Alan Willard Brown. The Metaphysical Society: Victorian Minds in Crisis, 1869-1880 [ <i>Maurice J. Quinlan</i> ]	503
Henry Alexander (translator). Four Plays by Holberg [ <i>Oscar Svarlien</i> ]	504
Alexander Gillies (editor). Journal Meiner Reise im Jahre 1769 by Johann Gottfried Herder [ <i>Henry C. Hatfield</i> ]	505
Jacquelin A. MacNaughton. Brentano's Novellen [ <i>Lydia Baer</i> ]	507
Leo Spitzer. Linguistics and Literary History [ <i>George W. Umphrey</i> ]	507
Books Received	510

## AGAINST MAROT AS A SOURCE OF MARLOWE'S *HERO AND LEANDER*

By G. P. SHANNON

One who has to refer to the sources of *Hero and Leander* will immediately find, first, that Marlowe followed no one version closely and second, that there are several versions in Latin, Italian, and French<sup>1</sup> (besides the Greek of "Musaeus") which he could have known. One of these is Marot's version of 1541, composed in 301 freely enjambed French decasyllabic couplets.<sup>2</sup> Apparently following the lead of Sidney Lee, who in 1910 described (without evidence) Marlowe's poem as among the "numerous progeny" of Marot's "beautiful idyll,"<sup>3</sup> a number of reliable commentators mention Marot's version—perhaps without definitely committing themselves, but in such a manner as to make the researcher (especially the Marlovian novice) feel uncomfortable until he has examined Marot for himself.<sup>4</sup> To save other students this waste of effort, this note will assert positively that Marot should be dropped from lists of possible sources.

An open-minded reading of Marot's poem<sup>5</sup> fails to show any resemblance to Marlowe in plot, incident, motive, character, or description which does not also exist between Marlowe and the Greek.<sup>6</sup> As to verbal parallels, I am aware of only two, both proposed by Miss G. Lazarus.<sup>7</sup> One of them is between Sestiad I, line 45:

So lovely faire was Hero, Venus Nun,

and Marot's line 59:

Estoit nonnain, à Venus dediée.

But several things nullify this parallel. The Greek poem itself speaks

<sup>1</sup> Respectively those of F. Paulinus, Tasso and Baldi, and Marot.

<sup>2</sup> In *Œuvres de Clément Marot*, ed. Georges Guiffrey (Paris, n. d.), 5 vols., II, 417-38.

<sup>3</sup> *French Renaissance in England* (Oxford, 1910), p. 112.

<sup>4</sup> Thus L. C. Martin, in *Marlowe's Poems* (London, 1931), p. 6, duly attributes most to Marlowe's own genius, but opens a doubt with the phraseology, "How far Marlowe was indebted to any of these possible 'sources,' ancient or modern, is another question as to which it is easier to speculate than to decide." John Bakeless, *The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe* (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), II, 103-04, leaves the question open with the words "No matter which version Marlowe used. . . ." Frederick S. Boas, *Christopher Marlowe, A Biographical and Critical Study* (Oxford, 1940), p. 227, mentions Marot among the "minor links" which have been suggested. Others (e.g., Emile Legouis, Laurie Magnus) have, without asserting influence, compared the versions of Marot and Marlowe. The cumulative effect of all such notices must be to impel an examination of Marot and other possible sources.

<sup>5</sup> With the kind assistance of Professor John C. Dawson, formerly of the Department of Romance Languages of the University of Alabama.

<sup>6</sup> This remark would include also the Latin of F. Paulinus, 1587.

<sup>7</sup> Cited by L. C. Martin, in *Marlowe's Poems*, pp. 6 and 30.

in at least six lines of Hero's priesthood. The word *nun* as "A priestess or votaress of some pagan deity" has four *NED* citations earlier than 1600, two of them with reference to nuns of Bacchus! Marlowe uses the phrase *Venus Nun* again in *Sestiad I*, line 319, at which point Marot offers no parallel;<sup>8</sup> and in his *Ovid's Elegies*, I, x, 50, "the holy Nunne"<sup>9</sup> Tarpeia is crushed beneath Sabine gauntlets.

Clearly there is no reason to assume that Marlowe's use of *nun* is derived from Marot. Since, as Mr. L. C. Martin states,<sup>10</sup> Miss Lazarus' other parallel is even less convincing, the evidence for Marot's influence appears to be zero. It is to be hoped, therefore, that future editors and commentators will omit all mention of Marot as a possible source. And on those occasions when he must be named among those who have treated the story of *Hero and Leander*, care should be taken that no ambiguous phraseology suggests a misleading association between Marot and Marlowe.

American Association of University Professors  
Washington, D. C.

<sup>8</sup> Conversely, Marot's *nonmain* in lines 124 and 230 finds no echo in Marlowe; nor do the terms *religieuse* (line 154) and *fille à Venus consacrée* (line 255).

<sup>9</sup> For Ovid's *sacrae virginis*. Both Varro (Bk. V, Sec. 41) and Propertius (IV, iv) represent Hero as a Vestal virgin.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 6. Miss Lazarus' *Technik und Stil von Hero und Leander* is at present inaccessible to me, and Martin apparently considered her second parallel too remote to require citation.

# ANOTHER SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ANGLO-SAXON POEM

By ALBERTA TURNER

Professor Francis Lee Utley<sup>1</sup> has drawn our attention to two Anglo-Saxon poems by Abraham Wheloc and William Retchford, printed at Cambridge, 1641, in *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis* . . . , a miscellany of poems written by Cambridge faculty and students to celebrate the return of Charles I from Scotland. Professor Utley explains that the poems are significant not only as the first two Anglo-Saxon poems ever printed and the first known to have been written in more than five hundred years, but as evidence that even before the publication of a complete Anglo-Saxon grammar or dictionary, or even a volume of verse,<sup>2</sup> the Cambridge lecturer in Anglo-Saxon and one who was probably his student had a creditable grasp of Anglo-Saxon grammar and pronunciation and a knowledge of metrics which was not bad, considering the circumstances.<sup>3</sup>

We can now add to Professor Utley's findings another Anglo-Saxon poem which appeared before Somner's dictionary, Hickes's grammar, or Junius' Caedmon. The poem was contributed by Joseph Williamson, B.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, to the *Musarum Oxoniensium 'Ελαιοφορία. Sive, Ob Faedera, Auspiciis Serenissimi Oliveri* . . . , a miscellany of the same type as the *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis* . . . , published in 1654 to celebrate the treaty which ended Cromwell's indecisive war with Holland. The first fourteen lines were written in Anglo-Saxon and printed in Roman type, since Oxford did not acquire Anglo-Saxon types until 1655.<sup>4</sup> At this point Williamson must have lost his courage, for he wrote the last sixteen lines in French. Or perhaps he wished to make a learned impression by using two languages, a not uncommon practice in the miscellanies, where we often find poems half in Latin and half in Greek. The lines of Anglo-Saxon, which alone concern us, are these:

On there sibbe betweox Breotone & Holland

ANNE theod ætforan wæron we,	One people formerly were we,
Anes modores sunu, oth that sæ	One mother's son, until the sea
(Swa men secgeath) us todælod.	(So men say) divided us.
Æfter that anne heorte and heafold [sic]	After that one heart and head

<sup>1</sup> "Two Seventeenth-Century Anglo-Saxon Poems," *MLQ*, III (1942), 243 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Hickes's grammar was published in 1689, Somner's dictionary in 1659, and Junius' edition of Caedmon in 1655.

<sup>3</sup> Utley, *loc. cit.*, III, 243, 257-58.

<sup>4</sup> Eleanor N. Adams, *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800*, Yale Studies in English, ed. Albert S. Cook, LV (New Haven, 1917), 167.

We begen hæfdon, othæt æft  
 Totwæmth thruth us sæs-craeft.  
 Ac thonne ure Mars Neptun acwealde,  
 Wæs ylc Apollo, ond sibbe sealde.  
 Ac thyles us æft ge gehegiath,  
 Beoth ge gemindig nu we habbath  
 Dawides Hearpan for ure freondas,  
 Georges Blod-Rode for ure feondas.  
 Soth sy cower frith, welswa flite to-  
 dæloth,  
 Ge Neptunes Sunu, We his Hlaford beoth.

We both possessed, until afterwards  
 Trade divided us by anger.  
 But then our Mars quelled Neptune;  
 Apollo the same, and established peace.  
 But lest you later harry us,  
 Remember that now we have  
 David's harp for our friends,  
 George's bloody cross for our enemies.  
 Truly may peace be yours, as long as  
 you avoid strife;  
 Be you Neptune's son, we his lord.

If we wonder why the first Oxford poem in Anglo-Saxon should appear twelve years after the first Cambridge one, we must remember that in 1641 Cambridge was a center of Anglo-Saxon studies, while in 1654 Oxford was just beginning to attain a comparable position.<sup>5</sup> By this date Oxford had the valuable collections of Laud and was soon to have those of Selden (d. 1654). The presence of Francis Junius (patronized by Laud and Ussher) until 1651, and of his pupil Thomas Marshall until 1647, had done much to stimulate Saxon studies. William Dugdale had followed the king to Oxford in 1642 and had done much of the work for the *Monasticon* there during the war. Selden had already begun to correspond with Junius about acquiring Anglo-Saxon types. Perhaps most important of all, Oxford had been less severely affected by the war than had Cambridge. When, in 1657, Somner succeeded Wheloc as Cambridge Saxon lecturer, and moved to Oxford to complete his dictionary, Oxford became the center of Saxon studies, a position which she held for the next two centuries. Williamson's poem, therefore, seems to have been a sign of the same newly awakened linguistic and literary interest at Oxford that Wheloc's and Retchford's were at Cambridge.

We may wonder even more why Williamson should be the first and only contributor of an Anglo-Saxon poem to the Oxford miscellanies of this period, for he never wrote anything further in the language nor published any works of Anglo-Saxon scholarship. After he left Oxford, he entered a successful political career and finally became secretary of state. We find, however, that Williamson, like many of his contemporaries, had a strong interest in English antiquities, an interest which extended in his case to linguistics. As he grew in wealth and power, antiquarian research, or at least the patronage of it, was among his chief relaxations. He collected a large library of heraldic and historical manuscripts, including the collections of Sir Thomas Shirley, which he later left to Queen's College.<sup>6</sup> In 1679 he established an Anglo-Saxon lectureship at Queen's and installed in it

<sup>5</sup> For a full account of Anglo-Saxon scholarship at the universities in the first half of the seventeenth century, see Adams, *op. cit.*, Chap. II, and David C. Douglas, *English Scholars* (London, 1939), Chap. II and III.

<sup>6</sup> DNB article on Joseph Williamson.

William Nicolson,<sup>7</sup> whom he had already prepared for the post by sending him to Leipzig to study the Germanic languages.<sup>8</sup>

It is uncertain just how or to what extent Williamson studied Anglo-Saxon, since Oxford did not offer formal instruction in the language, and since his tutors, Thomas Smith and Thomas Lamplugh, were not noted as Saxonists. His poem was written too early to profit from the presence of Somner; he entered college too late (September, 1650) to have known Marshall. But he could have met Junius before the latter left in 1651, and profited from the older man's knowledge of Caedmon, and he certainly must have known Gerard Langbaine, provost of his own college, who had projected an edition of the *Chronicle* but had been anticipated by Wheloc. Once his interest was aroused, he could have read ample manuscript material in the Bodleian, as well as the scattered verse fragments printed in Wheloc's edition of Bede and the *Chronicle* (*Archaionomia*, 1644). He might have learned something of the structure and vocabulary of the language from such partial studies as Minsheu's *Guide into Tongues* (1617) and Meric Casaubon's *De Quattuor Linguis* (1650). In addition, he might have seen the earlier Cambridge miscellany and gained his idea of contemporary Anglo-Saxon poetry from Wheloc and Retchford; for miscellanies were regularly printed, and the two universities were fond of comparing and criticizing each other's attempts to compliment royalty.

In both form and content the poem closely resembles contemporary English occasional verse. It strikes exactly the right note of mingled friendship and superiority toward the defeated nation, and pays tribute in just proportion to England's military prowess and to divine aid. Like other Renaissance occasional verse, it uses classical rather than Saxon imagery, and employs modern rather than Anglo-Saxon verse forms. Even the word order is contemporary. The first eight lines, for example, would read as well and rhyme as well (or better) in translation as in the original—so well, in fact, that we might suspect the first draft of being in seventeenth-century English.

Though he wrote twelve years later, Williamson seems to know little more of Anglo-Saxon metrics than did Wheloc and Retchford. Instead of the unrhymed, four-stress, alliterative line, with medial caesura, he writes iambic tetrameter couplets, with caesura only where the sense would demand it in contemporary English. Even so, his meter is rough: the accent is usually (but not always) on the stressed syllables; some of the feet are irregular; and the last couplet seems to be a pentameter, perhaps influenced by the Anglo-Saxon hypermetric line. The first few lines are the most regular, but the rhythm breaks down in those following. Perhaps, as Utlley suggests of

<sup>7</sup> Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

<sup>8</sup> *DNB* article on William Nicolson.

Wheloc, Williamson has seen many Anglo-Saxon models and noted their apparent irregularity; or perhaps his limited knowledge of the language is not equal to the task of writing smooth verse in any meter. He does succeed, however, in advancing slightly over Wheloc and Retchford by using alliteration. But since he does not recognize the principle of the divided line, he frequently alliterates unaccented syllables, syllables in any position, or only two syllables in a line; and the loose line structure makes it uncertain whether he intends to alliterate initial vowels at all. At best he achieves only an occasional alliterative pair, such as *heorte* and *heafold* [sic]. The fact that his alliteration, like his meter, breaks down after the first few lines, and the fact that Wheloc and Retchford did not use alliteration at all, make us suspect that Williamson knows that some principle of alliteration is fundamental to Anglo-Saxon poetry, but that he does not know just what that principle is.

Because of its metrical irregularity, this poem is not so good a guide to the author's pronunciation as we should wish. But if we may take the fairly regular iambic tetrameter of the first few lines as the intended pattern and read the rest of the poem with this pattern in mind, we can note the following: like Wheloc and Retchford, he regards *ea* as a single syllable and uses it so consistently, pronouncing *secgeath* and *Hearpan* as two syllables, rhyming *heafold* [sic] with *toðelod*, and substituting *secgeath* for *secgath*. Like Retchford, he seems to regard *eo* in the same way, pronouncing *theod* and *heorte* as one syllable. His one dubious exception is the rhyme of *beoth* and *toðeloth*, but since *beoth* appears as a single syllable earlier in the poem, and since the meter of this couplet is especially difficult, we cannot be sure of even this exception. Unlike Wheloc and Retchford, Williamson makes final *e* consistently mute, pronouncing *anne*, *sibbe*, and *thonne* as single syllables. Finally, he may not understand the pronunciation of the digraph, for he rhymes *we* and *sæ*, *toðelod* and *heafold* [sic], and substitutes *thyles* for *thylæs*. In other words, Williamson falls into the natural beginner's error of pronouncing Anglo-Saxon sounds as if they were contemporary English.

In comparing Williamson's knowledge of Anglo-Saxon grammar with that of Wheloc and Retchford, we find that he does not need to know so much as they. Perhaps just because he is less sure of himself, he carefully avoids complex or idiomatic syntax, and thus achieves a fair measure of grammatical correctness. Like Wheloc and Retchford, he shows a clear, though not infallible, feeling for strong and weak substantives. He has mastered the commoner declensions, but fails to recognize the *r* and *nd* declensions. He recognizes common nominative and accusative endings and the genitive singular. But unlike Wheloc and Retchford, he has failed to master the less common cases. He writes his one dative plural as a nominative and omits the other more difficult cases entirely (though this omission may, of



course, be coincidental). Like Wheloc and Retchford, he clearly distinguishes between strong and weak verbs and between class I and II weak endings; also he is master of the irregular auxiliaries *beon* and *habban*, in the present and preterit, singular and plural, subjunctive and imperative. He uses only four adjectives: *gemindig*, *ylc*, and various forms of *ure* and *an* before nouns. But here he is not so fortunate and uses most of them with incorrect endings. With the indeclinable adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions, however, he has little trouble. His pronouns are correct, except when declined as adjectives; but, unlike Wheloc, he does not preserve dual number.

Like his grammar, Williamson's vocabulary is safely simple. Many of the words are close enough to modern English to need no glossary. The rest are used correctly according to definition. He has, however, several misspellings, chiefly (1) printer's or manuscript errors (*heafold* for *heafod*, *thruh* for *thurh*, *welswa* as one word instead of two) and (2) the errors already attributed to confusion of sounds (*thyles* for *thylas*, *secgeath* for *secgath*). On the whole, there are few misspellings, considering that Williamson had no complete dictionary in which to check variants.

In conclusion, we must say that Williamson's Anglo-Saxon shows no definite advance over that of Wheloc and Retchford. His pronunciation is, if anything, inferior; his grammar is nearly as good (perhaps because of his syntactical simplicity), but it is certainly no better; and his metrics show no progress except a dubious recognition of the alliterative principle. If this poem correctly illustrates the knowledge of Anglo-Saxon in 1654, we must conclude that the secret of Anglo-Saxon grammar was well on the way to solution, but that those of pronunciation and versification had far to go.

Ohio State University

## THE SECULAR AND RELIGIOUS POETRY OF HENRY VAUGHAN

By E. L. MARILLA

It is obvious that Henry Vaughan's rescue from long oblivion by nineteenth-century clerical editors was inspired more by evangelical interest than by artistic perception.<sup>1</sup> Devout men like John Mitford, R. A. Willmott, Richard Cattermole, H. F. Lyte, A. B. Grosart, keenly aware of the need of spiritual reassurance for an era disturbed by the teachings of the New Science, labored diligently to enlist the testimony of Vaughan's religious utterances. These men shared the common aversion of their time to the metaphysical style, but the piety of Vaughan's religious verse overcame their objection to his literary manner. Naturally, then, they did not appreciate his secular verse, especially since this was much in the metaphysical tradition. Eager for corroborative evidence, these and other admirers of the religious poetry found biographical and bibliographical "support" for their assumption that the secular poems represented false starts of poetic inspiration that later found expression in an entirely different vein. Thanks to their well-meant diligence, by the end of the nineteenth century Vaughan's status was that of an important religious poet whose "early" secular verse—the basis of his limited literary reputation during his own time—received little critical attention.

Without producing any substantiated judgment on the secular verse, criticism of the past forty-odd years has sustained by implication and repetitious statement the nineteenth-century assumption that the secular poems are experimental imitations (chiefly of John Donne) and have little artistic importance. True, in modern criticism there are occasional favorable notices of the secular poetry, but these are as vague and generalizing as the more numerous ones which have preserved the inherited estimate. Further, twentieth-century scholars, following nineteenth-century precedent, have vigorously sought support in biographical and bibliographical details for the notion that Vaughan's transition from secular to religious themes reflects a curious metamorphosis by which he suddenly came into possession of his poetic powers.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See my "Significance of Henry Vaughan's Literary Reputation," *MLQ*, V (1944), 155-62.

<sup>2</sup> Witness the long-lived theory that about 1647 Vaughan experienced a sudden and thoroughgoing religious conversion that changed completely his way of thinking and the manner and quality of his writing. William R. Parker ("Henry Vaughan and His Publishers," *Library*, fourth series, XX [1940], 401-11) has disposed of the basic assumptions in this theory. In "The Religious Conversion of Henry Vaughan" (*Review of English Studies*, XXI [1945], 12-22) I have argued that Vaughan's conversion represented a gradual intensification of religious feeling which began early in life, was accentuated during the late 1640's, and reached fulfillment about 1654.

The purpose of the present study is actually threefold: first, to show that the secular verse is characterized by craftsmanship that is distinctly similar to and but little less skillful than that of the religious poetry; second, to point out even more obvious, though hitherto unrecognized, parallels between the secular and religious verse that contradict the prevailing theory that the secular poems represent immature interests and manifest little promise of Vaughan's achievement as a religious poet; third, to illustrate, at the same time, the need of a reevaluation of his poetic work as a whole. This purpose can be achieved, I believe, through brief examination of specimens from *Silex Scintillans* (1650), *Poems* (1646), *Olor Iscanus* (1651), and *Silex Scintillans* (1655).

We may begin with a short poem (without title) from the 1650 *Silex Scintillans*.

Come, come, what doe I here?  
 Since he is gone  
 Each day is grown a dozen year,  
 And each houre, one;  
 Come, come!  
 Cut off the sum,  
 By these soil'd teares!  
 (Which only thou  
 Know'st to be true,  
 Dayes are my feares. 10

2.  
 Ther's not a wind can stir,  
 Or beam passe by,  
 But strait I think (though far,)  
 Thy hand is nigh;  
 Come, come!  
 Strike these lips dumb:  
 This restles breath  
 That soiles thy name,  
 Will ne'r be tame  
 Untill in death. 20

3.  
 Perhaps some think a tombe  
 No house of store,  
 But a dark, and seal'd up wombe,  
 Which ne'r breeds more.  
 Come, come!  
 Such thoughts benum;  
 But I would be  
 With him I weep  
 A bed, and sleep  
 To wake in thee.<sup>a</sup> 30

<sup>a</sup> *Works of Henry Vaughan*, ed. L. C. Martin (Oxford, 1914), II, 420. All references here to Vaughan's works are to this edition. This poem, commonly believed to have been inspired by the death of the poet's brother William, in 1648, has attracted much favorable notice, which represents, however, little more than acknowledgment of the author's deep feeling and pious sentiment.

This poem shows a subtle thematic development. It opens with dramatic abruptness, and the first quatrain stimulates interest through suggestion and suspense. From this quatrain one might infer that the poet is here moodily chiding himself for needlessly increasing his grief by remaining in the vicinity of a recently deceased friend or relative. We must read to the end of the stanza before it becomes apparent that, instead, he is pleading for death as an escape from a world made intolerable by his bereavement. The poet, however, does not imply that his life has been suddenly blighted by this one sorrow. Considered in its context, the statement that "Each day is grown a dozen year, And each houre, one" reveals that the stanza is the expression of one whose life had previously become a trial and who is now prostrate from a recent addition to his burden. The concluding lines of this stanza more perceptibly direct the appeal to the Deity and foreshadow clearer definition of the poet's attitude in the next.

The first four lines of the second stanza emphasize the poet's eagerness for death, and the subsequent couplet further intensifies the mood. The suggestion here that the appeal for death is inspired as much by Christian hope as by despair anticipates the final commitment in the last stanza. The first six lines of this reflect a conception of the tomb as a habitation of the body until an ultimate Resurrection. In this new context the poet's desire for immediate death as expressed in the next two lines appears logical, and the attitude that inspired the poem becomes completely defined and justified in the concluding couplet.

Contrary to the implication of previous criticism, the poem is more than a vigorous expression of religious faith. Quite obviously, its primary purpose is to project a mood of bereavement, and any evaluation of the poem that tends to overlook its objective (and, hence, its effective structure) is unreliable. And it deserves mention here that the strict classical regard for structural unity (as well as reliance upon dramatic effect) as exemplified in this poem is an important feature of Vaughan's method in his secular and religious poetry alike.

The method that characterizes the poem from *Silex Scintillans* is essentially the same as that employed in the following from *Poems*, Vaughan's first production:

To His Friend  
Being in Love.

Aske Lover, ere thou dyest; let one poor breath  
Steale from thy lips, to tell her of thy Death;  
Doating Idolater! can silence bring  
Thy Saint propitious? or will *Cupid* fling  
One arrow for thy palenes? leave to trye  
This silent Courtship of a sickly eye;  
Witty to tyranny: She too well knowes  
This but the incense of thy private vowes,

That breaks forth at thine eyes, and doth betray  
 The sacrifice thy wounded heart would pay; 10  
 Aske her, foole, aske her, if words cannot move,  
 The language of thy teares may make her love:  
     Flow nimble from me then; and when you fall  
 On her breasts warmer snow, O may you all,  
 By some strange Fate fixt there, distinctly lye  
 The much lov'd Volume of my Tragedy.  
     Where if you win her not, may this be read,  
 The cold that freez'd you so, did strike me dead.<sup>4</sup>

Despite its title,<sup>5</sup> this poem is a soliloquy, and here also is a progressive thematic development. The composition, like that just considered, opens abruptly, and suspense is created immediately. True, we recognize in the opening couplet a literary convention of the time and infer that the poem represents an expression of a desperate lover. But the couplet itself reveals neither what it is that the "Lover" is to "Aske" nor why he has gone far enough. From the next four lines one could infer that the speaker is diffidently considering whether he should openly declare his affection for a lady whom he has hitherto silently adored. The mood is intensified in the next four lines, and emphasis and unity are achieved through renewal of the initial entreaty in the subsequent couplet, which concludes the argument. And it is in this last couplet of the first paragraph that the real issue is revealed. Here we learn that the speaker, far from worshipping in silence, has despaired of the efficacy of mere words, and is debating whether he should confess with the convincing humility of tears the full measure of his love for the unresponsive lady. It is not by accident, of course, that the debate ends at the point where the issue becomes clearly defined.

The sudden change of tone in the next paragraph is dramatically correct. Here the problem is resolved, and the mood is that of resolute decision.<sup>6</sup> The overt and intense expression in this paragraph of the attitude that has been gradually revealed in the preceding verses provides emphasis, and strengthens the total effect of the poem. At

<sup>4</sup> *Works*, I, 6. There is no evidence for the traditional assumption that Vaughan's love poems reflect only interest in a conventional theme. The 1655 *Silex Scintillans* contains poems which critics believe to have been inspired by the death of his first wife. Parallels in imagery, as well as verbal echoes, show that the author of *Poems* was an admirer of William Habington's *Castara* (1634), which records its author's courtship and marriage. "To Amoret Weeping," the second from the last in the arrangement of the thirteen original compositions in *Poems*, is almost certainly addressed to the poet's wife, and it is quite possible that this production is modeled on the *Castara* and reflects in a large measure the author's first successful courtship and early married life.

<sup>5</sup> It can be that the poet supplied no title and that the publisher, deceived by the dramatic element, provided an erroneous one. It is also possible that the title represents the author's attempt to obscure a personal note in the composition.

<sup>6</sup> The metrical ruggedness of the first paragraph fortifies the distraught mood reflected there. The comparatively smooth rhythmical effect of the remaining lines is consistent with the new attitude of calm resolution.

the same time, this open manifestation of humility builds for the surprise ending, which, accordingly, has the dramatic force of an unexpected retaliation. But notwithstanding its element of surprise, this concluding couplet is closely integrated in the composition and, in fact, defines the attitude that inspired the poem.

A significant detail of the composition is its concrete imagery. This contributes much to the vigor of the expression and, hence, to its tone of spontaneity, which distinguishes the poem from much of the love verse of the time. To claim that this poem manifests unusual artistic skill, however, would be a mistake; but it is no less a mistake, certainly, to consider it inept and of no literary value.

In view of the similarity of method in the previous selections from *Silex Scintillans* and *Poems*, it is not surprising to find much the same kind of craftsmanship in the following specimen from the latter work:

To Amoret gone from him.

Fancy, and I, last Evening walkt,  
 And, *Amoret*, of thee we talkt;  
 The West just then had stolne the Sun,  
 And his last blushes were begun:  
 We sate, and markt how every thing  
 Did mourne his absence; How the Spring  
 That smil'd, and curl'd about his beames,  
 Whilst he was here, now check'd her streames:  
 The wanton Eddies of her face  
 Were taught lesse noise, and smother grace;      10  
 And in a slow, sad channell went,  
 Whisp'ring the banks their discontent:  
 The carelesse ranks of flowers that spread  
 Their perfum'd bosomes to his head,  
 And with an open, free Embrace,  
 Did entertaine his beamy face;  
 Like absent friends point to the West,  
 And on that weake reflection feast.  
 If Creatures then that have no sence,  
 But the loose tye of influence,  
 (Though fate, and time each day remove  
 Those things that element their love)  
 At such vast distance can agree,  
 Why, *Amoret*, why should not wee?<sup>7</sup>

This poem has appeared in more than one modern anthology as a single selection from Vaughan's secular verse, and it is almost certain that the melancholy tone and sensuous imagery of the composition have been its chief attraction. Apparently, however, no one has recognized that its nature imagery is an integral element in a carefully devised synthesis.

Here again is a progressive development of theme. The dramatic opening couplet introduces an atmosphere of solitude, but reveals

<sup>7</sup> *Works*, I, 8.

only that the poet is reflecting on his relationship with Amoret. The next eight couplets depict a nature scene which may at first seem to be a mere ornamental setting for the poet's solitary meditations. Despite evident modern appreciation of the imagery, this scene is in itself notable chiefly for its conventionality. Its imagery and concept, however, have a fundamental structural importance. In the context, the "blushes" of the personified "Sun" in the first of these eight couplets suggests romantic love. Hence, the mourning of "every thing" in the next symbolizes the grief of separated lovers. This concept is reinforced by the particularized behavior of the "Spring" in the next few lines, and is further intensified through additional concrete suggestion of romantic love in the description of the "flowers," receiving emphasis in the paradox of line 18.

It is obvious enough that the poet's own mood is mirrored in the scene envisaged here, but the passage is more closely integrated in the poem than may be immediately apparent. The concept of the affection of the spring and flowers for the sun is not a mere superimposed fantasy; it is based upon the philosophic idea (prevalent in metaphysical writers) that the Divine Spirit is immanent in all forms of being,<sup>8</sup> and that, accordingly, romantic love is a manifestation of a cosmic affinity. The imagery of the nature scene is a visualization of this affinity as operating among natural objects and is intended as "rational" reinforcement of the plea that emerges in the remaining verses (the periodic syntax of which suspends the ultimate conclusion till the last line). Thus considered, the poem turns out to be a carefully unified expression of a lover's disconsolate mood.

There is also an important relationship between the poet's method in the selection from *Silex Scintillans* and that in the following composition from *Poems*:

*To Amoret, of the difference 'twixt him, and other Lovers,  
and what true Love is.*

Marke, when the Evenings cooler wings  
Fanne the afflicted ayre, how the faint Sunne,  
Leaving undone,  
What he begunne,  
Those spurious flames suckt up from slime, and earth  
To their first, low birth,  
Resignes, and brings.  
They shoot their tinsill beames, and vanities,  
Thredning with those false fires their way;  
But as you stay  
And see them stray,  
You loose the flaming track, and subt'ly they  
Languish away,  
And cheate your Eyes.

10

<sup>8</sup> This idea, which goes back to Plato and is found also in the Hermetic writers, has long been recognized as an important element in Vaughan's religious verse.



Just so base, Sublunarie Lovers hearts  
 Fed on loose prophane desires,  
     May for an Eye,  
     Or face comply:  
 But those removed, they will as soone depart,  
     And shew their Art, 20  
     And painted fires.

Whil'st I by pow'rfull Love, so much refin'd,  
     That my absnt soule the same is,  
     Carelesse to misse,  
     A glauce, or kisse,  
 Can with those Elements of lust and sence,  
     Freely dispence,  
     And court the mind.

Thus to the North the Loadstones move,  
     And thus to them th' enamour'd steel aspires: 30  
     Thus, *Amoret*,  
     I doe affect;  
 And thus by winged beames, and mutuall fire,  
     Spirits and Stars conspire,  
     And this is LOVE.<sup>9</sup>

In this poem there is, again, a gradual thematic development, which reaches a conclusion in the last line. The first stanza envisages an instance of the sun's failure to sustain its elevating force upon lifted spirals of mist, and attributes this failure to the inevitable fanning of "the Evenings cooler wings." In the second stanza this phenomenon is projected in the casual observer's view and becomes the familiar fanlike design sometimes seen under the lowering sun (and commonly known as the sun's drawing of water).<sup>10</sup> Here it is an attractive deception, but by its close analogy with the process described in the preceding stanza it is an inevitable deception. The line-by-line parallel in imagery continues through the third stanza, where the "prophane desires" are analogous to the "spurious flames" and "false fires" of the preceding stanzas, and the "Eye or face" is a parallel of the "Sunne" in the first. Now in the poet's "scientific" view as reflected in the first stanza, the "flames" are caught up involuntarily by

<sup>9</sup> *Works*, I, 12-13.

<sup>10</sup> The concept of these first two stanzas is not a mere product of the poet's imaginative observation. The idea of the "low birth" of the "spurious flames" almost certainly reflects acquaintance with the Paracelsian theory of the Generation of the Elements, or, more particularly, the generation of the element of water. In this theory "putrefaction" is an inherent phase in the process of generation and consumption of that element (see *The Hermetical and Alchemical Writings of . . . Paracelsus the Great*, ed. A. E. Waite [1894], I, 231-33). Moreover, when we compare the imagery of these two stanzas with that of "The Showre" (p. 402, below), it becomes evident that both underlying concepts are based, in a large measure, upon the Aristotelian theory concerning "Exhalations" (see *De Mundo*, 394<sup>a</sup> 7-394<sup>b</sup> 18, in *Works of Aristotle*, translated under the editorship of W. D. Ross [Oxford, 1931], Vol. III). Cf. Vaughan's translation of Henry Nollius' *Hermetical Physick* (*Works*, II, 561-62).



the attraction of the sun, and the gradual weakening of that attraction is due to their impurity. Hence, by the close analogy that extends through the third stanza this becomes a "logical" argument that the beautiful woman (in this case, Amoret) is always endangered by her charms, since these, however chaste, naturally attract "Sublunarie" lovers whose affection, convincing though it may appear, is by its very nature transitory.

The basic concept of the poem becomes apparent in the last two stanzas. The first of these declares that the speaker's affection, unlike that of "prophane" lovers, is a constant spiritual affinity, and the second, in keeping with the method of the previous argument, "scientifically" establishes the assertion. The newly discovered principle of magnetism comported well with the widely current idea of the all-pervasiveness of the Divine Spirit (even in the stones), and we can deny the appropriateness of this concluding metaphysical conceit, it seems to me, only through failure to understand the poem.<sup>11</sup> The figure of the magnet here is not only philosophical reinforcement of the speaker's assertion in the preceding stanza, but is actually the foundation of the antithesis that constitutes the argument of the poem.

In its total effect "*To Amoret, of the difference*" is perhaps the least successful poem in the volume, but the opinion that its weakness resides in inept metaphysical conceits is not only incorrect, but, as we shall see, also illogical. Its effect is impaired, in the first place, by the over-explicit "philosophic" argument, and, besides, as a love poem it suffers from the detached mood that results from the predominance of the intellectual factor.

It is impossible, I submit, to reconcile the evidence of these specimens with the persistent assumption that Vaughan's secular poems represent naïve experiments with a method for which he had no aptitude and which he later, as a religious poet, abandoned. Plainly enough, essentially the same method is employed in all four selections, and it is no less obvious that the secular pieces exemplify skill in craftsmanship that strongly foreshadows the artistic quality of the poem from *Silex Scintillans*.

Examination of additional specimens will further illustrate the similarity in method between the secular and religious poetry and will show also even more obvious parallels. As a matter of fact, "*To Amoret, of the difference*" is related in more than one way to the following poem from the 1650 *Silex Scintillans*:

<sup>11</sup> Miss Joan Bennett (*Four Metaphysical Poets: Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Crashaw* [1934], pp. 76-77) specifically objects to this use of "the already hackneyed loadstone" but omits to acknowledge that the same device, employed in a similar concept, appears in "The Starre" (*Silex Scintillans*, 1655), a poem which, in fact, provides significant commentary on the passage under consideration.

## The Showre.

'Twas so, I saw thy birth: That drowsie Lake  
 From her faint bosome breath'd thee, the disease  
 Of her sick waters, and Infectious Ease.  
 But, now at Even  
 Too grosse for heaven,  
 Thou fall'st in teares, and weep'st for thy mistake.

## 2.

Ah! it is so with me; oft have I prest  
 Heaven with a lazie breath, but fruitles this  
 Peirc'd not; Love only can with quick accesse  
 Unlock the way, 10  
 When all else stray  
 The smoke, and Exhalations of the breast.

## 3.

Yet, if as thou doest melt, and with thy traine  
 Of drops make soft the Earth, my eyes could weep  
 O're my hard heart, that's bound up, and asleep,  
 Perhaps at last  
 (Some such showres past,)  
 My God would give a Sun-shine after raine.<sup>12</sup>

Important parallels between the two poems can hardly escape even casual observation. Quite obviously, the nucleus of "The Showre" is a metaphysical conceit based on the same natural phenomenon used in the first figure of the secular poem, and the same Paracelsian and Aristotelian theories underlying the imagery of that conceit are similarly fundamental in this poem. In structural pattern the poems are notably similar, and in tone, as well as in specific details of imagery, "The Showre" is distinctly reminiscent of the first two stanzas of "*To Amoret, of the difference*," and even verbal echoes occur. Moreover, the two poems are particularly alike in method of organization in that both rely heavily upon parallel and antithesis as integrating devices.

The opening stanza of "The Showre" serves as a framework for a progressive development of theme. In the parallel in concept between the first three lines of this stanza and the corresponding lines of the next, the "lazier breath" of the second is analogous to the "sick waters"<sup>13</sup> of the first; hence, the reference to the straying "Exhalations"<sup>14</sup> in the concluding lines of the second is an acknowledgment that these issued from an evil heart. But this same reference implies that "Love" could have given "quick accesse." The concept of the latter lines, however, is antithetical to that of the corresponding lines of the first stanza, and in the contrast between the behavior of the "lazier breath" and that of the "sick waters" lies the suggestion that

<sup>12</sup> *Works*, II, 412-13.

<sup>13</sup> For this idea of the impurity of the "waters" see commentary, above, on the first two stanzas of "*To Amoret, of the difference*."

<sup>14</sup> See note 10 above.

the "Exhalations" were ineffectual, not because they were impure, but because they did not humbly confess their unworthiness. The first three lines of the last stanza therefore imply that the way to grace is through the penitence of tears,<sup>18</sup> and the concluding lines reveal that the poem is an orthodox Christian's confession of insufficient humility and a prayer for increased awareness of human depravity as a means to salvation.

No more than passing notice of the following stanzas from "Disorder and frailty" (*Silex Scintillans*, 1650) is necessary to show that this poem, too, is related to "To Amoret, of the difference" not only by its pattern, but also by an underlying parallel in imagery:

## 2.

I threaten heaven, and from my Cell  
Of Clay, and frailty break, and bud  
Touch'd by thy fire, and breath; Thy bloud  
Too, is my Dew, and springing wel.  
But while I grow  
And stretch to thee, ayming at all  
Thy stars, and spangled hall,  
Each fly doth tast  
Poyson, and blast  
My yielding leaves; sometimes a shower  
Beats them quite off, and in an hour  
Not one poor shoot  
But the bare root  
Hid under ground survives the fall.  
*Alas, frail weed!*

## 3.

Thus like some sleeping Exhalation  
(Which wak'd by heat, and beams, makes up  
Unto that Comforter, the Sun,  
And soars, and shines; But e'r we sup  
And walk two steps  
Cool'd by the damps of night, descends,  
And, whence it sprung, there ends,)  
Doth my weak fire  
Pine, and retire,  
And (after my hight of flames,)  
In sickly Expirations tames  
Leaving me dead  
On my first bed  
Untill thy Sun again ascends.  
*Poor, falling Star!*<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> This idea—discernible, in fact, in the first poem considered here—represents a prominent theme in *Silex Scintillans*, appearing also, for instance, in the following: "The Call," "Thou that know'st for whom I mourne," "The Resolve," "The Match," "Rules and Lessons," "The Palm-tree," "The Timber." But in none of these is the idea more obvious than in "To Amoret Weeping" of *Poems*.

<sup>19</sup> *Works*, II, 445-46.

The neglect of the following poem from *Olor Iscanus* betrays an important oversight in the traditional conception of Vaughan's poetic development and literary achievement.

The Charnel-house.

Blesse me! what damp are here? how stiffe an aire?  
*Kelder* of mists, a second *Fiats* care,  
 Frontspeece o' th' grave and darkness, a Display  
 Of ruin'd man, and the disease of day;  
 Leane, bloudless shamle, where I can descrie  
 Fragments of men, Rags of *Anatomic*;  
 Corruptions ward-robe, the transplantive bed  
 Of mankind, and th' *Exchequer* of the dead.  
 How thou arrests my sense? how with the sight  
 My *Winter'd* blood growes stiffe to all delight? 10  
*Torpedo* to the Eye! whose least glance can  
 Freeze our wild lusts, and rescue head-long man;  
 Eloquent silence! able to Immure  
 An *Atheists* thoughts, and blast an *Epicure*.  
 Were I a *Lucian*, Nature in this dresse  
 Would make me wish a Saviour, and Confesse.  
 Where are you shoreless thoughts, vast tenter'd hope,  
 Ambitious dreams, *Aymes* of Endless scope,  
 Whose stretch'd Excesse runs on a string too high  
 And on the rack of self-extension dye? 20  
*Chameleons* of state, Aire-monging band,  
 Whose breath (like Gun-powder) blows up a land,  
 Come see your dissolution, and weigh  
 What a loath'd nothing you shall be one day,  
 As th' Elements by Circulation passe  
 From one to th' other, and that which first was  
 Is so again, so 'tis with you; The grave  
 And Nature but Complot, what the one gave,  
 The other takes; Think then, that in this bed  
 There sleep the Reliques of as proud a head 30  
 As stern and subtil as your own, that hath  
 Perform'd, or forc'd as much, whose tempest-wrath  
 Hath levell'd Kings with slaves, and wisely then  
 Calme these high furies, and descend to men;  
 Thus *Cyrus* tam'd the *Macedon*, a tombe  
 Checkt him, who thought the world too straight a Room.  
 Have I obey'd the *Powers* of a face,  
 A beauty able to undoe the Race  
 Of easie man? I look but here, and strait  
 I am Inform'd, the lovely Counterfeit 40  
 Was but a smoother Clay. That famish'd slave  
 Begger'd by wealth, who starves that he may save.  
 Brings hither but his sheet; Nay, th' *Ostrich-man*  
 That feeds on *steale* and *bullet*, he that can  
 Outswear his *Lordship*, and reply as tough  
 To a kind word, as if his tongue were *Buffe*,  
 Is *Chap-faln* here, wormes without wit, or fear  
 Defie him now, death hath disarm'd the *Bear*.  
 Thus could I run o'r all the pitteous score

Of erring men, and having done meet more, 50  
 Their shuffled *Wills*, abortive, vain *Intents*,  
 Phantastick *humours*, perillous *Ascents*,  
 False, empty *honours*, traiterous *delights*,  
 And whatsoe'r a blind Conceit Invites;  
 But these and more which the weak vermins swell,  
 Are Couch'd in this Accumulative Cell  
 Which I could scatter; But the grudging Sun  
 Calls home his beams, and warns me to be gone,  
 Day leaves me in a double night, and I  
 Must bid farewell to my sad library. 60  
 Yet with these notes. Henceforth with thought of thee  
 I'll season all succeeding Jollitie,  
 Yet damn not mirth, nor think too much is fit,  
 Excesse hath no *Religion*, nor *Wit*,  
 But should wild bloud swell to a lawless strain  
 One Check from thee shall *Channel* it again.<sup>17</sup>

The first line dramatically suggests that the speaker has just entered the charnel house, and the initial paragraph reflects his growing repulsion. The poet's sole purpose in this paragraph is to convey a mood, and it is debatable whether anywhere else he more successfully achieves his aim. The concrete imagery is, of course, an important factor in the effectiveness of these lines, and the elliptical style<sup>18</sup> contributes much to the appropriate acrid tone. In fact, the entire poem would serve admirably as an example of effective accommodation of imagery and sound to sense.

Poetic interest in the chastening message of the charnel house was, of course, conventional, but here the concept itself is not the poet's primary concern. The opening emphasis upon the irony of man's temporal aspirations introduces a theme of the poet's own that is forcefully developed in the subsequent divisions of the poem. The first four couplets of the second paragraph focus the admonitory implication of the charnel house upon the Parliamentarians, the poet's

<sup>17</sup> *Works*, I, 41-42. The original poems in *Olor Iscanus* show less even accomplishment than do those in *Poems*, but this unevenness should not distort estimates of the importance of this production as a commentary on Vaughan's artistic development. The poems represent a selection by a conscientious editor who was careful to include no composition that would incriminate the Royalist author, and who felt obliged, in view of the pious *Silex Scintillans* of the year before, to exclude the love verse written during the poet's early youth (see Parker, *loc. cit.*, XX, 407-11). When all the poems containing overt allusions to the war and all the love poems had been excluded, there were only twenty-one left—not enough to encourage further editorial choice. The four commendatory poems in this collection are neither more nor less inferior than many another utterance of this kind by the author's more esteemed contemporaries. In two of these ("Upon the *Poems* and *Playes* of . . . William Cartwright," lines 1-8, and "To the most Excellently accomplish'd, Mrs. K. Philips," lines 15-20 [*Works*, I, 55-56, 61-62, respectively]) Vaughan seems to disapprove the familiar fashion of literary flattery. And it is almost certainly an injustice to him to assume that he attempted more than friendly versifying in either "To his retired friend, an Invitation to Breckenock" or "Upon a Cloke lent him by Mr. J. Ridsley."

<sup>18</sup> The same device is used with similar effectiveness in two stanzas of "The Night" and throughout "Son-dayes" (*Silex Scintillans*, 1655, 1650, respectively).

prospering political enemies. In the next two couplets this reminder that the ambitious "*Chameleons of state*" must sometime pay their debt to nature is reinforced by a metaphysical conceit (reflecting the Aristotelian theory of the Generation of the Elements),<sup>10</sup> and the remaining lines of this section further emphasize the argument with parallel and example.

The poet quite probably was aware that the third paragraph might lead casual readers among his contemporaries to regard the poem as a "harmless" experiment with a familiar idea; but, in fact, throughout this last paragraph the admonishing theme, sufficiently focused in the preceding section, is continued and vigorously intensified. Here we find a relevant view of death as the Nemesis of *all* worldly power. This oblique reproof of what the poet considered a tragic case of arrogance and presumption begins with specific instances of the triumph of the charnel house. But more than ordinary rhetorical importance is involved in these examples. True, the allusion to the defeat of the charms of feminine beauty is safely general in its implication, as is also the pronouncement upon the conventionally disparaged miser's wealth. But last in what is obviously an ascending series comes notice of the annihilation of the arrogant "*Ostrich-man*," who clearly enough represents a Parliamentarian from a Royalist's point of view. With this additional glance at the enemies of the traditional religious and political order—whose ambition the typical Royalist like Vaughan regarded as defiance of divine law—the poet reinforces his thrust with a hurried résumé of the host of "erring men" who, for all their irrational ambition and arrogance, could not escape "this Accumulative Cell" and are now, the whole innumerable throng, mere dust that the poet himself "could scatter." This passage, though strenuously emphasizing the underlying thesis of the poem, tends, nevertheless, to become a digression, and the author's usual regard for structural unity is to be observed in the return to subtle but pointed denunciation, in the remaining lines of the poem, of the political and religious ideals of the reactionaries.

In the poem below (from *Silex Scintillans*, 1650) we detect further evidence that previous commentators have overlooked obvious and fundamental relationships between Vaughan's secular and religious verse.

#### The Check.

Peace, peace! I blush to hear thee; when thou art  
     A dusty story  
 A speechless heap, and in the midst my heart  
     In the same livery drest  
     Lyes tame as all the rest;  
 When six years thence digg'd up, some youthfull Eie  
     Seeks there for Symmetry

<sup>10</sup> See *De Caelo*, iii, 6, in *Works of Aristotle*, Vol. II.

But finding none, shal leave thee to the wind,  
 Or the next foot to Crush,  
     Scatt'ring thy kind 10  
 And humble dust, tell then dear flesh  
     Where is thy glory?

## 2.

As he that in the midst of day Expects  
     The hideous night,  
 Sleeps not, but shaking off sloth, and neglects,  
     Works with the Sun, and sets  
     Paying the day its debts;  
 That (for Repose, and darknes bound,) he might  
     Rest from the fears i' th' night;  
 So should we too. All things teach us to die 20  
     And point us out the way  
     While we passe by  
 And mind it not; play not away  
     Thy glimpse of light.

## 3.

View thy fore-runners: Creatures giv'n to be  
     Thy youths Companions,  
 Take their leave, and die; Birds, beasts, each tree  
     All that have growth, or breath  
     Have one large language, *Death*.  
 O then play not! but strive to him, who Can 30  
     Make these sad shades pure Sun,  
 Turning their mists to beams, their damps to day,  
     Whose pow'r doth so excell  
     As to make Clay  
 A spirit, and true glory dwell  
     In dust, and stones.

## 4.

Heark, how he doth Invite thee! with what voice  
     Of Love, and sorrow  
 He begs, and Calls; *O that in these thy days*  
     Thou knew'st but thy own good! 40  
     Shall not the Crys of bloud,  
 Of Gods own bloud awake thee? He bids beware  
     Of drunknes, surfeits, Care,  
 But thou sleep'st on; wher's now thy protestation,  
     Thy Lines, thy Love? Away,  
     Redeem the day,  
 The day that gives no observation,  
     Perhaps to morrow.<sup>20</sup>

The pattern of this composition resembles that of three poems previously considered, including "*To Amoret, of the difference*," and it is worth noting that the device of periodic syntax employed in the first stanza of that secular poem appears again in the opening stanza of this. But a much closer relationship exists between "The Check"

<sup>20</sup> *Works*, II, 443-44.

and "The Charnel-house." It seems significant, to begin with, that the title of the religious poem echoes the last couplet of the other, and an interesting parallel in concept and method of development is quite perceptible. "The Check" opens with a dramatic expression of disgust at the pretensions of mortality, and the first stanza derides man's worldly interests by focusing, let us note, upon his inevitable "dissolution" in the "humble dust" of the charnel house. The second stanza, like the third paragraph of "The Charnel-house," emphasizes the universality of death and thus reinforces the implied admonition to the worldly minded. The parallel with the secular poem continues in the third stanza, which, in the interest of unity and intensity, focuses again on the scene of physical disintegration. The first four lines of this stanza emphasize the concept introduced in the first stanza, and the remaining lines repeat and amplify the exhortation of the second—and contain verbal echoes of "The Charnel-house." The implication of the first two stanzas becomes explicit in the third, where the "one large language, *Death*," and "dust, and stones" are regarded as a benevolent though sorrowful agency (the "sad library" of "The Charnel-house," line 60) through which the Deity counsels man to seek haven in the spiritual life. And in this development we recognize the emergence of the basic theme, which receives dramatically appropriate emphasis in the concluding stanza.

"The Charnel-house" is plainly the more subtle of the two poems, and there might be some justifiable difference of opinion concerning their relative merit. More important is the fact that any estimate (however favorable) of "The Check" which ignores the relationship between its structure and its aim represents no less an injustice to the poet than does similar failure to interpret properly "The Charnel-house" and to consider its method of achieving its purpose.

We must include, finally, brief notice of the following from the 1655 *Silex Scintillans*:

The Garland.

Thou, who dost flow and flourish here below,  
To whom a falling star and nine dayes glory,  
Or some frail beauty makes the bravest shew,  
Hark, and make use of this ensuing story.

When first my youthfull, sinfull age  
Grew master of my wayes,  
Appointing errour for my Page,  
And darknesse for my dayes;  
I flung away, and with full crie  
Of wild affections, rid  
In post for pleasures, bent to trie  
All gamesters that would bid.  
I played with fire, did counsell spurn,  
Made life my common stake;



But never thought that fire would burn,  
 Or that a soul could ake.  
 Glorious deceptions, gilded mists,  
 False joyes, phantastick flights,  
 Peeeces of sackcloth with silk-lists,  
 These were my prime delights. 20  
 I sought choice bowres, haunted the spring,  
 Cull'd flowres and made me posies:  
 Gave my fond humours their full wing,  
 And crown'd my head with Roses.  
 But at the height of this Careire  
 I met with a dead man,  
 Who noting well my vain Abear,  
 Thus unto me began:  
 Desist fond fool, be not undone,  
 What thou hast cut to day 30  
 Will fade at night, and with this Sun  
 Quite vanish and decay.

*Flowres gather'd in this world, die here; if thou  
 Wouldst have a wreath that fades not, let them grow,  
 And grow for thee; who spares them here, shall find  
 A Garland, where comes neither rain, nor wind.*<sup>21</sup>

By its somber admonition to those preoccupied with the transitory awards of this life, the opening stanza recalls both "The Check" and "The Charnel-house," and the third line is a clear echo of lines 37-41 of the latter poem. The first ten lines of the "ensuing story" project (in dramatically appropriate lilting rhythm) the reckless attitude of the youthful "fool." The undertone of penitence, however, becomes distinct in the last two of these and anticipates the retrospective denunciation of his folly in the next four lines. And both in manner and imagery these are almost identical with lines 49-53 of "The Charnel-house," and even contain distinct verbal echoes of that passage. The next four lines depict the mounting recklessness of the youth's course and thus lend dramatic effect to the conclusion of the "story." In this conclusion it is revealed that the speaker's early consuming interest in transitory values was checked by the precepts of "a dead man"—that is, by the lesson of the charnel house. The corollary of this ominous though benevolent counsel of the "dead man" (again, the message of the "sad library") becomes in the last stanza explicitly the theme of the poem.<sup>22</sup>

Twentieth-century criticism has contributed much to an understanding of the poet's personality and has variously provided insight necessary to a broad perspective, but we cannot deny the evidence that proper interpretation and estimate of Vaughan's secular and religious poetry have not yet been achieved. I believe that the present

<sup>21</sup> *Works*, II, 492-93.

<sup>22</sup> There is an interesting biographical implication in the fact that the poem from *Olor Iscanus* reflects a disillusioned view of life that is represented in the second *Silex Scintillans* as inherent in a religious conversion.

study adequately illustrates the error of the prevailing theory that the secular verse reflects no important stage in the poet's artistic development. This assumption of previous criticism is sufficiently indicted, I submit, in that it not only denies the quite demonstrable fact that the poet's method in the secular verse is basically the same as that in *Silex Scintillans*, but also overlooks a further relationship no less obvious and significant than prominent parallels in imagery, concept, theme, and even attitude.<sup>23</sup> Nor can we dismiss the implication of the corollary that critical opinion on the religious poetry reflects oversight of the same relevant details. But more important still is the positive evidence set down here that in two ways Vaughan suffers the injustice of deficient critical attention. We cannot avoid, on the one hand, the ironic conclusion that, although modern criticism has persistently deplored the previous neglect of the poet for more than a century, he is still denied the measure of prestige which careful evaluation of his secular verse will award. It is no less evident, on the other, that notwithstanding his acceptance today as an important sacred poet, the actual merit of his religious poetry yet awaits proper acknowledgment. Indeed not the least strange anomaly in the history of Vaughan's literary reputation is the fact that, despite his rapid increase in stature during the past five decades, his real artistic im-

<sup>23</sup> The frequency of such parallels invites mention of some additional examples. The concept of an ultimate resurrection of the body which we observed in two poems from *Silex Scintillans* is, in fact, prominent in the religious verse, appearing also, for instance, in "Death," "Resurrection and Immortality," "Thou that know'st for whom I mourne," and "Buriall." The same idea is basic in "Upon the Priorie Grove" (*Poems*) and is clearly implied in "To the River Isca" (*Olor Iscanus*). Moreover, like "Son-dayes" and "The Book" of *Silex Scintillans*, "Upon the Priorie Grove" implies an ultimate restoration and refinement of the natural world, including the "Creatures." Contemplation of the soul's capacity for exalted flight which inspired "The Eagle" (classified as a secular poem in *Thalia Rediviva*) is clearly reflected in "Resurrection and Immortality," "Cock-crowing," "Isaacs Marriage," and "Silence, and stealth of dayes" (*Silex*). There is also a close relationship in both concept and manner between lines 47-72 of "Isaacs Marriage" and lines 59-74 of "An Elegie on the death of Mr. R. Hall" (*Olor Iscanus*). In concept and imagery, both the concluding passage of "Fair and yong light!" and the last three couplets of "The Ass" (*Silex*) are distinctly reminiscent of lines 30-58 of "To my Ingenuous Friend, R. W." (*Poems*). The imagery of the opening lines of "The Recovery" (a sacred poem of *Thalia Rediviva*) significantly resembles that of lines 5-15 of "A Rhapsodis" (*Poems*), and lines 35-46 of the latter poem are curiously but clearly echoed in "Ascension-day" (*Silex*). Careful comparison of "The World" and also lines 45-52 of "The Tempest" (*Silex*) with "In Amicum feneratorum" and "To his friend —" (*Olor Iscanus*) reveals interesting resemblances in theme and imagery. The theme of "To Amoret Weeping" (*Poems*) appears also in lines 33-44 of "Day of Judgement" (*Silex*) and is prominent in "The Request" and "The World" (*Thalia Rediviva*). There is a particularly obvious relationship between "The importunate Fortune, written to Doctor Powel of Cantre" (secular poem in *Thalia Rediviva*) and "The Proffer" (*Silex*). These two poems are much alike in theme and manner, show distinctly similar moods, and represent arguments based upon almost identical concepts. In fact, close comparative examination of the poems leads almost inevitably to the conclusion that both were inspired by a single event or set of circumstances.

portance has not yet been recognized. When a true evaluation of his poetic work is accomplished, Vaughan's reputation will be far less dependent upon extra-literary interest. His prestige will then have better insurance than mere accident during eras like our own when readers cease to share the evangelical enthusiasm of the poet's nineteenth-century clerical editors.

*Louisiana State University*

PARADISE LOST AND THE DIGBY  
MARY MAGDALENE

By WILLIAM ELTON

A notable anticipation of the infernal council and temptation scenes of *Paradise Lost* occurring in the miracle-morality play of *Mary Magdalene* (ca. 1480-1520)<sup>1</sup> has apparently not been pointed out.<sup>2</sup> In Part I, Scene 7, of this play, Satan enters, announcing his intention to ruin man for gaining what Lucifer had lost.<sup>3</sup> Next, like Milton's devil, he calls a council of his knights to plot revenge by causing a woman to sin, in this case, the innocent Mary Magdalene.<sup>4</sup> The World sends Sensuality, his messenger, to summon Flesh to Satan's council; upon Flesh's arrival, Satan begins the debate on Mary. (Compare, in *P.L.*, Book I, Satan's speech to the demons in hell and their summoning to a full council.) At last, the Council agrees that, if Mary remains virtuous, she may destroy hell, and Lechery, with the aid of the other Deadly Sins, is dispatched to seduce her. The above is reminiscent of Book II of Milton, where, however, Satan himself undertakes the mission, rather than send an underling.

The next scene of the play takes us to the Temptation, Book IX of the epic. The flattering words of Lechery to Mary<sup>5</sup> are comparable to those of the Serpent to Eve.<sup>6</sup> Both Mary and Eve, pleased and deceived by the words of the Tempter, marvel at this reasonable speech.<sup>7</sup> Like Satan returning to Pandemonium in the epic to boast of his victory, the Bad Angel in the play relates to the devils Mary's fall, for "of hur al helle xall make reioysseyng."<sup>8</sup> Triumphant, like Milton's demons at the news, the Devil bids Lechery return to maintain Mary in sin. Ultimately, in keeping with the morality pattern to which they are related, both play and epic conclude with the repentance of the sinners and the mercy of God, somewhat qualified in the latter instance.

<sup>1</sup> F. J. Furnivall, ed., *The Digby Plays*, E.E.T.S., extra series LXX (London, 1896), 53-136.

<sup>2</sup> It is not mentioned in A. H. Gilbert, "Milton and the Mysteries," *SP*, XVII (1920), 147-69; Herbert Harris, "Was *P. L.* Suggested by the Mystery Plays?" *MLN*, X (1895), 445-46; and R. L. Ramsay, "Morality Themes in Milton's Poetry," *SP*, XV (1918), 123-58; nor in any of the relevant source studies, e.g., O. H. Moore, "The Infernal Council" (from Claudian to Milton), *MP*, XVI (1918), 169-93, and P. E. Dustoor, "Legends of Lucifer in Early English and in Milton," *Anglia*, LIV (1930), 213-68.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. lines 358-72.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. lines 371-76, 383-84.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. lines 440-44.

<sup>6</sup> *P.L.*, IX, 532-34, 538-42.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *M.M.*, lines 447-51; *P.L.*, IX, 550-51, 631, 733-34, 736-38.

<sup>8</sup> Line 559; cf. lines 547-59, and Bk. X of *P.L.*

In sum, elements of similarity include: (1) the announced intent of Satan to seek revenge on Man for Lucifer's downfall; (2) the infernal council to plot evil against mankind; (3) the devil's journey for the purpose of the Temptation; (4) the devil's flattering words to a woman; (5) her agreeable response; (6) the Fall; (7) the triumphant return of the devil to the council of hell with his tidings; (8) the repentance of the sinner; and (9) God's grace.

The significance of the Digby *Mary Magdalene* in relation to *Paradise Lost* is that, in contrast to a number of earlier mysteries which Allan H. Gilbert cites as a background for Milton's work, it is a comparatively late play of the miracle-morality type; in contrast to the foreign sources which O. H. Moore offers for the infernal council scene, it is a native work in an indigenous tradition of which Milton was aware;<sup>9</sup> and, in its notably similar situations and speeches, it may indicate participation in a possibly standardized convention which Milton perhaps inherited.

On the other hand, there may be evidence which indicates a possibly stronger affiliation. For example, where did Milton get the typically morality characters which appear in his early plans in the Trinity Manuscript? Three times on a single page Milton began a list of characters in a tentative plan for a play on the *Paradise Lost* theme: (1) first plan: Michael, Heavenly Love, Chorus of Angels, Lucifer, Adam, Eve, Serpent, Conscience, Death, Labour, Sickness, Discontent, Ignorance, with others, Faith, Hope, Charity; (2) second plan: Moses, Wisdom, Justice, Mercie, Heavenly Love, the Evening Starre, Chorus of Angels, Lucifer, Adam, Eve, Conscience, Death, Labour, Sickness, Discontent, Ignorance, Feare, Faith, Hope, Charity; and (3) third plan: Moses, Justice, Mercie, Wisdome, Chorus of Angels, Heavenly Love, Evening Starre, Lucifer, Adam, Eve, Conscience, Labour, Greife, Hatred, Envie, Warre, Famine, Pestilence, Sickness, Discontent, Ignorance, Winter, Heat, Tempest, Feare, Death, Faith, Hope, Charity.<sup>10</sup> From these lists may be drawn several deductions: (1) Milton was familiar with the miracle and morality plays, more probably in text or manuscript than in actual performance, for they had ceased to be generally shown; (2) at this early stage (1639-1642)<sup>11</sup> Milton conceived *Paradise Lost* in the light of the miracle-morality traditions; and (3) his extremely wide-ranging reading habits would lead him, in his search for materials and models, to some such play as the Digby *Mary Magdalene*, which is perhaps the most important extant play of the miracle-morality kind, and whose mingled character types resemble those of Milton's early plans. The manuscript of this play formed part (MS Digby 133, fols. 95-145)

<sup>9</sup> Cf. below.

<sup>10</sup> *John Milton's Complete Poetical Works Reproduced in Photographic Facsimile*, ed. Harris F. Fletcher (Urbana, Illinois, 1945), II, 16-17.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. David Masson, *Life of John Milton* (London, 1871), II, 121.

of the collection of 238 manuscripts which Sir Kenelm Digby gave to the Bodleian Library in 1634,<sup>12</sup> where Milton could easily have consulted it, and where his friend, John Rous or Rouse, was Librarian from 1620-1652.<sup>13</sup>

What James Holly Hanford declared thirty years ago perhaps remains almost as true today: "... the consequences of Milton's dramatic heritage have never received full recognition..."<sup>14</sup> Although it is not here insisted that this play is among Milton's sources, its relationship with *Paradise Lost* is worth pointing out, not only because earlier students seem to have neglected it, but also because, as Gilbert says,

we may feel, in spite of Milton's distance from the actual performances of the mysteries, that he in some way represents the summation of whatever of permanent value they had for the world. Surely no poet writing later than Milton—sometimes called a belated Elizabethan—could have produced Biblical poems quite like *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, for after his day the life of the mysteries had ceased to be a reality.<sup>15</sup>

*Brown University*

<sup>12</sup> W. D. Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library*, Oxford (Oxford, 1890), pp. 78-82.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 107-08.

<sup>14</sup> "The Dramatic Element in *Paradise Lost*," *SP*, XIV (1917), 178. Cf. W. R. Parker, "The Trinity Manuscript and Milton's Plans for a Tragedy," *JEGP*, XXXIV (1935), 225-32. In the Trinity MS, Milton sketched about sixty possible dramatic topics from the Old and New Testament; if, then, Milton was so intent on writing a drama based on biblical themes, would he not, in his omnivorous reading, have sought and found examples of such treatments in the earlier English drama?

<sup>15</sup> *Loc. cit.*, XVII, 169.

## SMOLLETT AND PETRONIUS

By FRANCESCO CORDASCO

Smollett's place in the picaresque genre is not difficult to assign, and he himself has much to say about the role he is to play in the development of the genre that has spiritually enveloped him.<sup>1</sup> But we err if we see Smollett and his picaresque propensities only in terms of the *Gil Blas* upon which "the following sheets I have modelled . . . taking the liberty, however, to differ from him in the execution, where I thought his particular situations were uncommon, extravagant, or peculiar to the country in which the scene is laid."<sup>2</sup> Certainly, *Le Sage* and the *Gil Blas* are the most important single formative influences and the main stream through which the *esprit* comes to Smollett,<sup>3</sup> but into this stream there empty many smaller backwaters which significantly change the texture of the whole. These tributary influences have never received merited investigation.<sup>4</sup>

Into the main stream of the *Gil Blas* influence, via the omnivorous reading of the hopeful Smollett, came the Spaniards Aleman,<sup>5</sup> Espinel<sup>6</sup> and Quevedo,<sup>7</sup> and the disputed *Lazarillo de Tormes*; and closer still the Frenchmen d'Aubigné,<sup>8</sup> Sorel,<sup>9</sup> l'Hermite,<sup>10</sup> Scarron,<sup>11</sup> and Furetière;<sup>12</sup> and at the head-source, weakly but distinctly, the Roman

<sup>1</sup> See the Preface to *Roderick Random* and the dedicatory letter to the *Adventures of Ferdinand Count Fathom*.

<sup>2</sup> *Roderick Random*, p. vii. All references are to the *Works of Tobias Smollett*, ed. by J. P. Browne, 8 vols. (London, 1872). This fine edition, which is not a re-issue of the early Moore edition, contains, in addition to the five novels, *Travels through France and Italy*, *Adventures of an Atom*, the complete plays and poems, *An Account of the Expedition Against Carthage*, Moore's *View of the Commencement and Progress of Romance* and his *Life of Smollett*, and important extracts from the *Life of Anderson* together with the more important Smollett letters. I mention this in the light of the unfortunate lack of an annotated Smollett bibliography.

<sup>3</sup> See F. Wershoven's monograph, *Smollett et Le Sage* (Brieg, 1883).

<sup>4</sup> See Frank Chandler, *The Literature of Roguery* (Boston, 1907), II, 309-20, and Wershoven, *op. cit.*, for the usual disregard. Eugène Joliat, *Smollett et La France* (Paris, 1935), in his discussion of "Smollett, les Picaresques et Le Sage," gives but peripheral and unsatisfactory mention to these authors.

<sup>5</sup> *Guzman de Alfarache*.

<sup>6</sup> *Escudero Marcos de Obregon*.

<sup>7</sup> *Historia de Don Pablo de Segovia*.

<sup>8</sup> *Aventures du Baron de Faeneste*.

<sup>9</sup> *Francion*. Joliat's statement (*op. cit.*, p. 25) that "malgré les quelques scènes et personnages que Smollett semble devoir à *Francion*, ce roman n'a eu sur lui aucune influence générale" hardly warrants the extended citation of influence which prefaces it.

<sup>10</sup> *Page Disgracié*.

<sup>11</sup> *Roman Comique*. Joliat (*op. cit.*, p. 27) admits that "l'influence du *Roman comique* sur Smollett a été considérable"; but he fails to relate to it the important *esprit pétro*ne which is so vital a part of the *Roman Comique*.

<sup>12</sup> *Roman Bourgeois*.

Petronius whose *Satyricon* enjoys the distinction of giving first the strong and pliable *gusto picaresco* life and motif.

There can be no question that Smollett knew the *Satyricon*, and knew it well.<sup>13</sup> If we are unwilling to admit the tenuous evidence of the *esprit pétrope* so pervasively present in the novels (excepting *Humphry Clinker*), still we are presented with two instances in the novels which invite comment and parade Petronius before the eye.

The first of these, in *Roderick Random*,<sup>14</sup> introduces Roderick to the shameless Earl Strutwell who, in process of fleecing the young man, introduces a most fascinating commentary on Petronius Arbiter. Is it not significant that Smollett, in permitting this intrusion of belles lettres, should select Petronius for extended comment? And certainly the meager comment of Roderick in contradistinction to the elaborate defense by the Earl of Petronius indicates the partiality of Smollett for the Roman *arbiter elegantiae*. The Earl's pronouncement that "Here's a book . . . written with great elegance and spirit, and though the subject may give offence to some narrow-minded people, the author will always be held in esteem by every person of wit and learning"<sup>15</sup> is certainly Smollett's own conviction. And the Earl continues further:

I own . . . that his taste in love is generally decried, and indeed condemned by our laws; but perhaps that may be more owing to prejudice and misapprehension, than to true reason and deliberation. The best man among the ancients is said to have entertained that passion; one of the wisest of their legislators has permitted the indulgence of it in his own commonwealth; the most celebrated poets have not scrupled to avow it; at this day it prevails not only over all the east, but in most parts of Europe; in our own country it gains ground apace, and in all probability will become in a short time a more fashionable vice than simple fornication.<sup>16</sup>

And Smollett, marching Roderick about, has him surmise the worst and, aghast, in damnation, exclaim poetically:

Eternal infamy the wretch confound  
Who planted first that vice on British ground!  
A vice! that spite of sense and nature reigns,  
And poisons genial love, and manhood stains.<sup>17</sup>

Smollett's satire is complete with the close of the discussion:

The earl smiled at my indignation, told me he was glad to find my opinion of the matter so conformable to his own, and that what he had advanced was only to provoke me to an answer, with which he professed himself perfectly well pleased.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Smollett seems to have known the translation of the *Satyricon* by William Burnaby, which had appeared in 1694 and had gone through seven editions by 1736. He had also probably used the standard Latin edition of Burman (1709).

<sup>14</sup> Chapter LI.

<sup>15</sup> *Roderick Random*, p. 439.

<sup>16</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 440

<sup>18</sup> *Idem*.



If Petronius is used in *Roderick Random* outwardly and for purposes of giving subtle color to one of Roderick's encounters, Smollett, later, in *Peregrine Pickle*, appropriated a whole and important segment of the *Satyricon* for use in one of the long novel's chapters.<sup>19</sup>

The *Cena Trimalchionis* of the *Satyricon* tells in *extenso* the story of a riotous feast which could easily and with almost perfect symmetry absorb Smollett's "entertainment in the manner of the ancients." If difference is found, it is only a difference of length. Qualitatively, both remain identical. In both there is the same display of gastronomic erudition and incident buffoonery.<sup>20</sup>

But above and beyond analogous incident there is a temperamental similarity between Petronius and Smollett which cannot fail to capture attention. Petronius' lines,

Ipsi qui cynica traducunt tempora scena  
Nonnunquam nummis vendere verba solent,

addressed to the Stoics, were fondly remembered by the irreconcilable disputant of the *Critical Review*.

Long Island University

<sup>19</sup> Chapter XLIV.

<sup>20</sup> Cf., for example, the stumbling of the boy over Trimalchio in the *Satyricon* with the accident of the unfortunate *petit-maitre* and the German baron.

## HAZLITT'S APHORISMS

By STEWART C. WILCOX

The French have consciously treated the aphorism as a minor genre of literature, whereas the critics, by neglect rather than by open statement, imply that the English have not. Logan Pearsall Smith's little volume, *A Treasury of English Aphorisms*,<sup>1</sup> has, therefore, the spirit of pioneer criticism, for it recognizes the aphoristical attainments of Bacon, Halifax, Chesterfield, Samuel Johnson, Blake, Hazlitt, and Emerson as literary feats of a class or kind, as a part of their writing which they carefully nourished and in which they obviously took keen delight. Unlike most of the others, however, Hazlitt revealed his interest in the literature of aphorisms by writing a whole book called *Characteristics in the Manner of Rochefoucault's Maxims*, as well as three collections of them for magazines. Moreover, so much of his writing is shot through with allusive references and apothegms that in a few pieces—"The Fight," for example—their absence is cause for notice.

The strongest influences upon Hazlitt's terseness of style were evidently the aphoristical essay, the Character, and, especially in the hands of La Rochefoucauld, the aphorism itself.

In the Preface to *Characteristics*, which appeared in 1823, Hazlitt tells how he was stimulated to undertake this form of composition; he says that his attempt "was suggested by a perusal of Rochefoucault's Maxims and Moral Reflections."

I was so struck with the force and beauty of the style and matter, that I felt an earnest ambition to embody some occasional thoughts of my own in the same form. This was much easier than to retain an equal degree of spirit. . . . There is a peculiar *stimulus*, and at the same time a freedom from all anxiety, in this mode of writing. A thought must tell at once or not at all. . . . An observation must be self-evident; or a reason or illustration . . . must be pithy and concise. Each Maxim should contain the essence or groundwork of a separate Essay, but so developed as of itself to suggest a whole train of reflections to the reader, and it is equally necessary to avoid paradox or commonplace. The style also must be sententious and epigrammatic, with a certain pointedness and involution of expression, so as to keep the thoughts distinct, and to prevent them from running endlessly into one another.<sup>2</sup>

In following La Rochefoucauld's example, however, Hazlitt did not follow his philosophy. Although both were concerned with human conduct, with tearing aside the veil which hides us from ourselves, their differences were basic. Hazlitt was an ethical idealist, whereas La

<sup>1</sup> *A Treasury of English Aphorisms*, ed. Logan Pearsall Smith (New York, 1928).

<sup>2</sup> *Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed. P. P. Howe (London and Toronto, 1930-34), IX, 165. Hereafter referred to as *Works*.

Rochefoucauld found the motives of human action in *amour-propre*, love-of-self. "Our virtues," says La Rochefoucauld in the epigraph of his book, "are usually but vices disguised." To the emphasis of this paradox Hazlitt objected violently, for his pet philosophical observation was that self-love and benevolence (though we are less vividly aware of the latter) are emotions of the same kind; consequently, men are not wholly self-interested, and benevolent action does exist. By this he seems to mean that the imagination fosters what we call empathy. "The secret of our self-love," he says in Characteristic XXV, "is just the same as that of our liberality and candour. We prefer ourselves to others, only because we have a more intimate consciousness and confirmed opinion of our own claims and merits than of any other person's."<sup>3</sup> Yet Hazlitt's maxims, like La Rochefoucauld's, have no religious coloration, and like his presuppose no absolute ethical standards. Both men were empirical skeptics.

Though Hazlitt differed from La Rochefoucauld in his interpretation of the principles of human action, he recognized that analysis usually discloses human follies, and that aphorisms describing these shortcomings are more striking than ones describing virtue. In spite of this limitation, a surprisingly large number of the characteristics set forth established truths regarding goodness: "The fear of punishment," Hazlitt declares, "may be necessary to suppression of vice; but it also suspends the finer motives of virtue."<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, he was more like his forerunner when he wrote "We as often repent the good we have done as the ill."<sup>5</sup>

As we might expect, Hazlitt's Characteristics are less finely turned than La Rochefoucauld's, and more of them are longer. Hazlitt, too, gives freer play to his prejudices and makes more topical allusions to events and people. Still it is only fair to observe that La Rochefoucauld spent six or seven years at his chateau polishing the gems of his art, whereas Hazlitt struck his off in the rough. Apparently he felt less the need for classical perfection and elegant, epigrammatic point than did La Rochefoucauld.

Everywhere in his essays and criticisms Hazlitt used Characters and Character-portraits. Although unlike Lamb he avoided the quaint oddities of the seventeenth-century authors, he is, nevertheless, indebted to them both in method and expression. The terseness of the Character comes from describing abstract qualities by means of personifications or similes placed in antithetical constructions. The effect of such description somewhat resembles the effect of the aphoristic essay, as in Montaigne's or Bacon's early ones, an abruptness that checks the flow of familiar style.

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, IX, 170.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 189.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 188.

The following character of the bookworm, for example, enlivens Hazlitt's essay "On the Conversation of Authors" with satirical point and caricature:

The person I mean has an admiration for learning, if he is only dazzled by its light. He lives among old authors, if he does not enter much into their spirit. . . . He is busy and self-involved. He hangs like a film and cobweb upon letters, or is like the dust upon the outside of knowledge, which should not be rudely brushed aside. He follows learning as its shadow; but as such, he is respectable. He browses on the husk and leaves of books, as the young fawn browses on the bark and leaves of trees. Such a one lives all his life in a dream of learning, and has never once had his sleep broken by a real sense of things. . . . The legend of good women is to him no fiction. . . . His mind cannot take the impression of vice: but the gentleness of his nature turns gall to milk. . . . He draws the picture of mankind from the guileless simplicity of his own heart: and when he dies, his spirit will take its smiling leave, without having ever had an ill thought of others, or the consciousness of one in itself!<sup>6</sup>

The character writer is an analyst, and analysis breeds conciseness. For illustration, take the sketch of Godwin in that Boswellian document *The Conversations of Northcote*:

[Godwin] has written against matrimony, and has been twice married. He has scouted all the common-place duties, and yet is a good husband and a kind father. He is a strange composition of contrary qualities. He is a cold formalist, and full of ardour and enthusiasm of mind; dealing in magnificent projects and petty cavils; naturally dull, and brilliant by dint of study; pedantic and playful; a dry logician and a writer of romances.<sup>7</sup>

Perhaps the culmination of Hazlitt's art in the character genre is his well-known tirade against fustian writers in the essay "On Familiar Style," those hypercritics who are thinking "of tall phantoms of words, abstractions, *genera* and *species*, sweeping clauses, periods that unite the Poles, forced alliterations, astounding antitheses. . . ." In such sketches and characters,<sup>8</sup> or in one like the talker-at-you in his piece "On the Conversation of Authors," Hazlitt generalizes, often in a trenchant, pithy style, regarding the attributes of types of people.

A third influence upon Hazlitt's conciseness was Bacon, in whom Hazlitt admired not only massiveness of intellect, but also the imagery and splendor which are often linked with his aphoristical qualities. In "Character of Lord Bacon's Works" Hazlitt elaborates:

His sayings have the effect of axioms, are at once striking and self-evident. He views objects from the greatest height, and his reflections acquire a sublimity in proportion to their profundity, as in deep wells of water we see the sparkling of the highest fixed stars. The chain of thought reaches to the centre, and ascends the brightest heaven of invention. . . . His style is equally sharp and sweet, flowing and pithy, condensed and expansive, expressing volumes in a sentence, or amplifying a single thought into pages of rich, glowing, and delightful eloquence.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Works*, XII, 42-44.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 235.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 246.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 327-28.

Aphorisms may be distinguished by the devices used to give them point and by their subject matter. In Chesterfield the device known as the "turn" first came into prominence in English prose. It has been well defined as "a deft antithesis of phrasing by which some antithesis of thought is echoed and reinforced."<sup>10</sup> "To be remembered after we are dead is but a poor recompense for being treated with contempt while we are living," says Hazlitt.<sup>11</sup> Again, repetition produces similar effect: "We talk little if we do not talk about ourselves."<sup>12</sup> La Rochefoucauld, Chesterfield's master in this art, sometimes combines both antithesis and repetition: "We can forgive those who bore us, but not those whom we bore." On the other hand, when Hazlitt said "the perfection of art is the destruction of art," he was balancing dangerously upon the brink of paradox by his use of the repetitive, antithetical turn. For paradox, as he well knew, can rob an aphorism of force, since in being apparently absurd, or contradictory to accepted belief, it does not plunge straight to the heart of an idea. Yet we should remember, as one critic has observed, that "a legitimate paradox is not a falsehood which seems true, but a truth that seems false; and in that guise it often gains admission where truth in homespun commonplace would be ignored or turned away."<sup>13</sup> For example, in the opening paragraphs of "Whether Genius is Conscious of its Powers?" Hazlitt claims that "No man is truly himself, but in the idea which others entertain of him," whereupon the startled reader pursues an explanation of why we are not truly ourselves in our own minds.

The subject matter of maxims offers a second mode of distinguishing them. When a commonplace falls newly minted from a sententious mind, the added luster of striking imagery or phrasing redeems it from platitude. Two illustrations must suffice: one by Blake, "The busy bee has no time for sorrow"; and one by Hazlitt, "The light of art, like that of nature, shines on all alike; and its benefit, like that of the sun, is in being seen and felt."<sup>14</sup> Another kind of observation is the giving of a fillip to an accepted, often hackneyed, saw or proverb by adding to it: "If familiarity in cities breeds contempt, ignorance in the country breeds aversion and dislike."<sup>15</sup> Still another sort is the imaginative, almost mystical, variety, which reaches its height in the poetical prose of Blake. Many of his sayings have youthful verve and rise above disillusion: "To create a little flower is the labour of ages," or "One thought fills immensity."<sup>16</sup> Now and then Hazlitt approaches

<sup>10</sup> *A Treasury of English Aphorisms*, ed. Smith, p. 26.

<sup>11</sup> *Works*, IX, 228.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 193.

<sup>13</sup> C. T. Winchester, "Hazlitt," *A Group of English Essayists* (New York, 1910), p. 69.

<sup>14</sup> Blake, "Proverbs of Hell," *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*; Hazlitt, "On the Catalogue Raisonné," *Works*, IV, 144.

<sup>15</sup> *Works*, XII, 75.

<sup>16</sup> Blake, "Proverbs of Hell," *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*.

this form, as when he remarks that "There can never be another Jacob's dream. Since that time the heavens have gone farther off, and grown astronomical."<sup>17</sup>

Lifting his maxims from their context, however, is likely to obscure their relation to his method as essayist. His statement that "Each maxim should contain the essence or groundwork of a separate essay" is illustrated by his own practice. Of the forty pieces in *The Round Table*, six begin with a terse observation; and seven of the pieces in *Table-Talk* and *The Plain Speaker* start off similarly. "On Pedantry," for instance, begins thus:

The power of attaching an interest to the most trifling or painful pursuits, in which our whole attention and faculties are engaged, is one of the greatest happinesses of our nature. . . . He who is not in some measure a pedant, though he may be a wise, cannot be a very happy man.<sup>18</sup>

Although the method of using initial aphorisms is not unique, resembling Montaigne's habit of beginning with a remark culled from one of his ancients, or Johnson's use of truisms about man and life with which to start his *Rambler* papers, it differs from the use of introductory aphorisms that have little to do with the main idea of the essay. It is worthy of comment that the proportion of Hazlitt's essays beginning aphoristically is greater than that of any other essayist except Bacon, though Johnson runs Hazlitt a close second.

To be observed also is Hazlitt's skill in tersely concluding a paragraph or section of discussion. In the essay "On the Fear of Death" he sums up an observation as follows:

It is not surprising that we are forgotten so soon after we quit this mortal stage: we are scarcely noticed, while we are on it. It is not merely that our names are not known in China—they have hardly been heard of in the next street. We are hand in glove with the universe, and think the obligation is mutual.<sup>19</sup>

His liking for pithiness of phrase is also revealed in passages that progress in terse sentences lacking colloquial fluency:

Passion is the undue irritation of the will from indulgence or opposition; imagination is the anticipation of unknown good: affection is the attachment we form to any object from its being connected with the habitual impression of numberless sources and ramifications of pleasure. The heart is the most central of all things. Our duties also . . . are uniform, and must find us at our posts. If this is ever difficult at first, it is always easy in the end. The last pleasure in life is the sense of discharging our duty.<sup>20</sup>

The last sentence here from the essay "On Novelty and Familiarity" is Characteristic CCCCIX. Though this staccato series of definitions is somewhat disjunctive to be grasped easily in one reading, Hazlitt's

<sup>17</sup> *Works*, V, 9.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 80.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 328.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 310.

penchant for definition frequently helped him in his Characters; for example, the following passage from "On the Look of a Gentleman":

The character of a gentleman (I take it) may be explained nearly thus: —A blackguard . . . is a fellow who does not care whom he offends: —a clown is a blockhead who does not know when he offends: —a gentleman is one who understands and shows every mark of deference to the claims of self-love in others, and exacts it in return from them.<sup>21</sup>

Hazlitt has again and again been called bitter and sardonic because he could heartily endorse the pleasures of hating—"Old friendships are like meats served up repeatedly, cold, comfortless, and distasteful. The stomach turns against them."<sup>22</sup> And yet, as it applies to Hazlitt's life, there is probably less truth in this aphorism, certainly no more, than in its converse. Santayana's apothegm that "Almost every wise saying has an opposite one, no less wise, to balance it" may profitably be remembered in reading an author of Hazlitt's method and temperament. He seems to me to be disillusioned without being cynical. The essential reality of his life was illuminated, I think, when he said: "The contemplation of truth and beauty is the proper object for which we were created, which calls forth the most intense desires of the soul, and of which it never tires." To truth and beauty, as frequently to their opposites, he brought a rare power of compressing his responses into words.

*University of Oklahoma*

---

<sup>21</sup> *Works*, XII, 217.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 131.

## KEATS'S "HYMN TO PAN" AND THE LITANY

By JAMES THORPE

The so-called "Hymn to Pan," lines 232-306 of the first book of Keats's *Endymion*, resembles in one way the service of the Litany of the Church of England more than it does any kind of hymn. Its common title derives from the usual and proper emphasis on the substance of the ode—a magnification of Pan by a luxuriant and unpruned description of his attributes, characteristics, and activities. The title refers only to the subject matter, however, for a hymn as such has no single standard form. On the other hand, the similarity to the Litany is confined to the superficial aspects of form and construction. The nature of the praise is certainly more significant than the framework into which it has been cast, but a consideration of its structure indicates a relation to the Litany more pronounced than that to a hymn, and provides a brief commentary on its meaning.

There is a distinct consistency in the construction of the ode that sets it apart from other poems in which a similar device is occasionally employed. Each of its first three strophes consists basically of a vocative address and a plea; the fourth and fifth strophes are, respectively, a series of six vocative addresses and a series of three pleas. In addition, each of the first three strophes includes, in connection with its plea, one or more appeals through the virtue contained in some intercessory power. The scaffolding becomes apparent when one ignores the 90 per cent comprising the content of the ode and looks at the remainder. Set down in tabular form (with the appeals for intercession enclosed in parentheses by the present writer), the ode presents the following short view:

- [I] O thou, . . . (By thy love's milky brow!  
By all the trembling mazes that she ran,  
Hear us, great Pan!
- [II] O thou, . . . be quickly near,  
(By every wind that nods the mountain pine,  
O forester divine!
- [III] Thou, . . . (By all the echoes that about thee ring.)  
Hear us, O satyr king!
- [IV] O Hearer to the loud clapping shears . . . :  
Winder of the horn . . . :  
Breather round our farms . . . :  
Strange ministrant of undescribed sounds . . . :  
Dread opener of the mysterious doors . . . —  
Great son of Dryope . . .
- [V] . . . Be still the unimaginable lodge  
. . . Be still the leaven  
. . . Be still a symbol. . .



Although such an emasculated product may not be appealing, it is revealing. The ode appears from this synoptic view as a general supplication made up of a series of suffrages. Each suffrage consists of a vocative address (as "O thou") and a plea (as "Hear us, great Pan!"), with appeals for intercession (as "By thy love's milky brow!") inserted in the first three suffrages.

Similarly, the Litany is the penitential offering of a general supplication. It consists of solemn entreaties that are repeated responsorially, followed by an anthem, versicles, and collects. It is the major part of the Litany, the responsorial entreaties, that is of principal interest in connection with Keats's poem. On the basis of general form and spirit, there is a noticeable resemblance between that entire section of the Litany and the outline of the ode. Of the six general responsorial parts (initial invocations, long petition, deprecations, obsecrations, intercessions, and final invocations), the resemblance to the invocations and obsecrations is most marked.<sup>1</sup>

Each of the addresses of the first invocations is directly followed by the same plea, with each response repeating the preceding address and plea.

O God the Father of heaven: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

*O God the Father of heaven: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.*

O God the Son, Redeemer of the world: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

*O God the Son, Redeemer of the world: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.*

O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

*O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.*

O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three Persons, and one God: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

*O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three Persons, and one God: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.*

The same general pattern of address and plea to a Deity is represented here as in Keats's poem. If these suffrages are reduced to their fundamentals by eliminating the descriptive material, they are found to be basically identical: "O God: have mercy upon us."

<sup>1</sup> The text followed herein is that of the 1662 (fifth) edition of the *Book of Common Prayer*, which is still officially in use, and which had undergone relatively minor changes from the first edition (1549) through the second (1552), third (1559), and fourth (1604) editions. For general questions on the *Book of Common Prayer*, see the fine brief study by Stanley Morison, *The Book of Common Prayer* (Cambridge, 1943), or the more detailed work of Francis Procter and W. H. Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1901); each of these two books contains a critical bibliography of the considerable scholarship on the subject. The *Book of Common Prayer* of the Protestant Episcopal Church provides a readily available text for general comparative purposes; it follows, with considerable changes, the 1662 Anglican prototype.

In the final invocations (including the triple *Kyrie eleison*), which are simpler and more varied, similarity in phraseology occasionally joins the other and more important likeness of pattern.

Son of God: we beseech thee to hear us.  
*Son of God: we beseech thee to hear us.*

O Lamb of God: that takest away the sins of the world;  
*Grant us thy peace.*

O Lamb of God: that takest away the sins of the world;  
*Have mercy upon us.*

O Christ, hear us.  
*O Christ, hear us.*

Lord, have mercy upon us.  
*Lord, have mercy upon us.*

Christ, have mercy upon us.  
*Christ, have mercy upon us.*

Lord, have mercy upon us.  
*Lord, have mercy upon us.*

"Son of God: we beseech thee to hear us" and "O Christ, hear us" are not far-removed in spirit or phraseology from "O thou, hear us, great Pan!" and "Thou, hear us, O satyr king!"

The obsecrations of the Litany form a plea for mercy based on the redemptive work of Christ:

By the mystery of thy holy Incarnation; by thy holy  
 Nativity, and Circumcision; by thy Baptism,  
 Fasting, and Temptation,  
*Good Lord, deliver us.*

By thine Agony and bloody Sweat; by thy Cross and  
 Passion; by thy precious Death and Burial; by thy  
 glorious Resurrection and Ascension; and by the  
 coming of the Holy Ghost,  
*Good Lord, deliver us.*

The similar passages in the ode invoke aid in the name of fair Syrinx, mazes, the wind, and echoes.

The framework of the ode appears, then, as a synthesis of the forms of the invocations and obsecrations of the Litany. The addresses and pleas in the ode (as "O thou, hear us, great Pan!") are related in phrasal form to the invocations of the Litany (as "O Christ, hear us"), while the appeals for intercession of the ode (as "By all the echoes that about thee ring") resemble the obsecrations of the Litany (as "By the mystery of thy holy Incarnation"). But the descriptive material in the suffrages of the Litany (unlike that in the ode) reinforces the basic pattern, the tone, and the spirit.

The ode is, in brief, a supplication to Pan to receive a hymn of praise. There is an essential incongruity in its tone, perhaps, for the

lush nature of the praise is far from the penitential spirit of the externally imposed supplicatory office. The chorus that performs the entire song,

The many that are come to pay their vows  
With leaves about their brows,

seems to be endowed with an awareness of the mixed nature of its office. This recognition is neatly indicated in the concluding lines when they exclaim:

we humbly screen  
With uplift hands our foreheads, lowly bending,  
And giving out a shout most heaven rending,  
Conjure thee to receive our humble Paean.

Their song, it will be remembered, is performed while the sacrifice of teeming sweets, bay leaves, frankincense, and parsley is being consumed by fire on the shrine, and while the sacrificial wine is soaking into the ground. Wordsworth's notorious stricture on the ode becomes more understandable if we dare assume that the regular communicant recognized the basic incongruity and was mildly disgusted by it.<sup>2</sup>

I suggest that the framework of the ode took its present form because the Litany was in Keats's subconscious memory during the process of composition—and thus he became one of that innumerable company who have enriched English literature with rhythms, phrases, and patterns filtered through their minds from the *Book of Common Prayer*.<sup>3</sup>

Since Keats can hardly be called a churchly Christian—despite Haydon's best efforts—it may be of interest to examine several possible ways in which he may have attained a degree of intimacy with the *Book of Common Prayer*. In Richard Woodhouse's list<sup>4</sup> of the seventy-six works (152 volumes) in Keats's library, one finds included a one-volume bound folio "Prayer Book"<sup>5</sup> and a one-volume bound

<sup>2</sup> A further inconsistency in tone is evident in the types of descriptive material employed in the ode. The hamadryads, bees, fir cones, lamblins, mildews, and the like of the first three strophes and most of the fourth are studiously appropriate to a shepherd principality. For no determinable reason, an abrupt change takes place toward the end of the fourth strophe; from there on one hears only of such abstractions as "mysterious doors leading to universal knowledge" and the "heaven, that spreading in this dull and clodded earth gives it a touch ethereal."

<sup>3</sup> The prayer to Diana, lines 302-32 of the second book of *Endymion*, provides a contrast. The prayer is quite removed from any formal ecclesiastical framework (except for the echo—again of the Litany—"Young goddess . . . Deliver me" at the end) and is given over to self-exhilaration. When Endymion urges Diana to assuage the pains of Alpheus and Arethusa at the end of the second book (line 1,005), he invokes her aid "By our eternal hopes."

<sup>4</sup> Sidney Colvin, *John Keats* (New York, 1917), pp. 556-58.

<sup>5</sup> Doubtless an issue of the 1662 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer*. Woodhouse would surely have used a different listing had it been other than the prayer book of the established church.

18mo "French Prayer Book."<sup>6</sup> It appears probable that he was not unfamiliar with any of the relatively small number of books in his library. His family associated themselves with the Church of England,<sup>7</sup> and Keats probably attended services, at least in his childhood and youth. He would have become familiar with the essential parts of the *Book of Common Prayer* and doubtless have joined many times in the Litany, which (because of the extended participation on the part of the congregation) readily makes a permanent impression on a person attending the service.<sup>8</sup> Finally, as a kind of negative observation, the possible "sources" of the poem—especially those which feature a festival or hymn to Pan, such as Drayton's *Man in the Moone* and *Endimion and Phoebe* and Chapman's translation of the Homeric *Hymn to Pan*—do not disclose the similarity such as is here noted between the poem and the Litany.

Princeton University

<sup>6</sup> It is likely that this volume was an issue of the 1662 translation by John Durel of the *Book of Common Prayer* of the same year. His is the most prominent French translation, was royally directed to be used by all French congregations conforming to the Church of England, and has been used in the Channel Islands, for instance, since its issuance. In this connection, see Procter and Frere, *op. cit.* (third impression, 1905 *et seq.*), p. 202.

The list also includes "Southwell's Bible" (in a one-volume bound folio edition), a "Bible" (in a one-volume bound 12mo edition), and "Bishop Beveridge's Works" (in a one-volume bound octavo edition).

<sup>7</sup> Both of his mother's marriages were performed in St. George's Church in Hanover Square, the three youngest boys were christened at St. Leonard's Shoreditch, Keats and his sister Fanny were christened at St. Botolph's Without in Bishopsgate, and his mother and father were buried in the north aisle of the Church of St. Stephen in Coleman Street. See Marie Adami, *Fanny Keats* (London, 1937), pp. 13-21.

<sup>8</sup> It is barely possible—but not likely—that the *Book of Common Prayer* may have been used for the regular prayers and chapel services at John Clarke's academy at Enfield during Keats's residency—from 1803 to the end of the mid-summer term in 1811. One would expect the Keatses to have chosen a conforming school for their sons, especially since the parental sights had originally been set on Harrow. However, John Clarke was undoubtedly a Dissenter; he had been an usher, or underteacher, in the academy operated by the Rev. John Collett Ryland, the noted Baptist preacher and schoolmaster, before he married Ryland's stepdaughter and became a headmaster himself. (See Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke, *Recollections of Writers* [New York, 1878], pp. 1-3 and the *DNB* account of Ryland.) There is no significance in Charles Armitage Brown's error in calling John Clarke the Reverend Mr. Clarke in his *Life of John Keats* (edited by Dorothy Hyde Bodurtha and Willard Bissell Pope [Oxford, 1937], p. 41).

## BYRON AND MOORE

By HOOVER H. JORDAN

The frequency with which one encounters in the periodicals of the early nineteenth century articles reviewing together the works of Byron and Moore would indicate even on the surface that a certain parallelism of form and content existed between their works. But investigators, even in our own day, have never pointed out how striking this parallelism is. It is revealed most fully by an examination not just of the writings themselves, but of the social intercourse between the two poets.

Moore, of course, was the older man and had already acquired a reputation as a poet by the time that Byron was beginning to read poetry intensively. The *Odes of Anacreon* and more particularly the *Poems of Thomas Little* made an almost instantaneous appeal to the youthful Byron. In 1820 he wrote of this to Moore: "I have just been turning over *Little*, which I knew by heart in 1803, being then in my fifteenth summer. Heigho! I believe all the mischief I have ever done, or sung, has been owing to that confounded book of yours."<sup>1</sup> Although Byron always thought of these poems as an outstanding breach of the laws of propriety in literature, his admiration for them was sincere and lasting.

Poor LITTLE! sweet, melodious bard!  
Of late esteem'd it monstrous hard  
That he, who sang before all, —  
He who the lore of love expanded, —  
By dire reviewers should be branded,  
As void of wit and moral.

And yet, while Beauty's praise is thine,  
Harmonious favourite of the Nine!  
Repine not at thy lot.  
Thy soothing lays may still be read,  
When persecution's arm is dead,  
And critics are forgot.<sup>2</sup>

The *Poems of Thomas Little*, quite understandably, were haunting the mind of Byron as he wrote his early *Hours of Idleness*. In the preface to this volume he admitted, "In the original pieces there may appear a casual coincidence with authors whose works I have been accustomed to read; but I have not been guilty of intentional plagiarism." To trace in full the coincidences with Moore's writing would demand a separate article, but space may allow here the state-

<sup>1</sup> R. E. Prothero, ed., *Works of Lord Byron: Letters and Journals* (London, 1901), V, 42.

<sup>2</sup> "To the Earl of Clare," *Hours of Idleness*.

ment of a few. The prefaces to the volumes, first of all, are very similar in tone. Moore, in his guise of editor of the works of Thomas Little, began his preface in this manner:

The Poems which I take the liberty of publishing, were never intended by the author to pass beyond the circle of his friends. . . . The particular situations in which they were written; the character of the author and of his associates; all these peculiarities must be known and felt before we can enter into the spirit of such compositions. This consideration would have always, I believe, prevented the author himself from submitting these trifles to the eye of dispassionate criticism.

In his own preface, it will be remembered, Byron tried to "arrest the arm of censure" by claiming a similar indulgence.

The content of the poems is in general very much alike. The major theme is love: its pleasures and pangs, its constancy and changeability. Many of the poems are also paraphrases or translations from the classics. Byron, in particular, tried to show his skill in translation; Moore had already demonstrated his in the *Odes of Anacreon*. They both attempted the medieval ballad, Byron in "Oscar of Alva" and Moore in such poems as "The Shield" and "The Ring." Their diction abounds in the stock phrases which they inherited from the preceding century, that succession of *gems* and *bowers* and *blisses* and *chains* and *garlands* and *billows*. Both employed personification freely and did not hesitate to form the possessive case of these nouns, for which both were castigated by Coleridge: *Pity's* hand, *Fancy's* flowers, *Pleasure's* breath, and the like. It is thus apparent that both poets chose the same type of theme and presentation for their first volume of original poetry.

As Byron had delighted in the *Poems of Thomas Little*, it is not strange that he gave an eager reception to Moore's *Odes and Epistles*: "I remember our [Byron and Edward Long] buying, with vast alacrity, Moore's new quarto (in 1806), and reading it together in the evenings."<sup>3</sup> Published in 1806, *Odes and Epistles* treated the public to the same sort of melodious and amatory verse that had made a financial success of the *Little* poems, but one new note was added—satire. In describing his impressions of America, Moore gave vent to scathing denunciation of the inconsistencies and corruption which he found in the new state. This method of satire, owing its direct allegiance to such eighteenth-century writers as Johnson and Churchill, traces back through the centuries at least to the Roman Juvenal, and was, therefore, nothing new to the reading public of 1806. Yet it is interesting to note that Byron's second volume of poetry, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, employed the same kind of scathing and denunciatory satire as *Odes and Epistles*. There is no similarity of subject matter between the two satires, but Byron must have been

<sup>3</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, V, 169.

impressed by the success in his own day of this type of denunciation, for it was in 1807, just a year after the appearance of Moore's work, that Byron made his first draft of the poem under the original title of *British Bards*. Shortly after this year, both poets again followed the same course by turning from Juvenalian satire to a more adroit and piquant form which endeavors to make its victim ridiculous as the butt of mocking laughter.

In 1808 Moore published the first number of the *Irish Melodies*, which immediately won their way into Byron's heart. He later wrote Moore: "Your 'Oh breathe not,' 'When the last glimpse,' and 'When he who adores thee,' with others of the same minstrel;—they are my matins and vespers."<sup>4</sup> This opinion he substantiated when he constructed his "Gradus ad Parnassum," based upon his conception of the rank of the leading poets in the estimation of the public. Scott came first, Rogers second, Moore and Campbell third, followed by Southey, Wordsworth, and Coleridge, and then the many. He was careful to say, however, that this was not his own judgment. "For, to me, some of Moore's last *Erin* sparks—'As a beam o'er the face of the waters'—'When he who adores thee'—'Oh blame not'—and 'Oh breathe not his name'—are worth all the Epics that ever were composed."<sup>5</sup>

Byron was thus very favorably disposed toward Moore before they ever met in person. Their meeting, however, which occurred in 1811, came about through extremely inauspicious circumstances. In *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* Byron had scoffed at the duel fought by Moore and Jeffrey:

Can none remember that eventful day,  
That ever glorious, almost fatal fray,  
When Little's leadless pistol met his eye,  
And Bow-street myrmidons stood laughing by?

On reading these lines, Moore became very angry, for he had been to some pains to publish in the newspapers a true account of the affair and was feeling very irritable on the subject. As soon as Byron's name appeared as author of the lines, Moore dispatched a letter to him demanding a settlement for having given the lie publicly to Moore's explanation. Byron, however, had left on a trip to the Continent and never received the note, which was suppressed by Hodgson. Between that time—January, 1810—and the fall of 1811 when Byron was again back in England, Moore had married and become settled. Time had cooled his anger, so that when he again addressed Byron, in October, 1811, he declared that honor could be satisfied by a simple explanation from Byron, and even expressed hope of becoming Byron's friend. Thus hearing for the first time of

<sup>4</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, II, 301.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 344.



Moore's resentment, Byron wrote in answer that he had no intention of "giving the lie," as he had never seen Moore's published explanation, but that he would welcome any proposal not compromising his honor. After an interchange of letters they finally agreed to an amicable meeting at the home of Samuel Rogers. The story of that dinner party, at which Byron, much to the astonishment of the other guests, ultimately dined off potatoes mashed down and soaked in vinegar, has been told too often to need repeating.

The friendship of Byron and Moore blossomed immediately. Byron's letters became enthusiastic about his new acquaintance, "the epitome of all that is exquisite in poetical and personal accomplishment."<sup>6</sup> Byron found not just a new drinking companion, but an experienced man of letters whose judgment he began to deem valuable. "If my worthy publisher wanted a sound opinion," he wrote in December, 1811, "I should send the MS. to Rogers and Moore, as men most alive to true taste."<sup>7</sup> It cannot be repeated too often that in this personal relationship there was nothing subservient in Moore's attitude toward Byron. If anything, at this time it was Byron who looked up to Moore. On returning from the Continent in the fall of 1811, Byron had indeed become dejected over his lack of true friends. His mother had died, Matthews and Wingfield were also dead, and when Hobhouse left him for a trip to Ireland, Byron wrote: "At three-and-twenty I am left alone, and what more can we be at seventy?"<sup>8</sup> As a poet he had but *Hours of Idleness* and *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* to his credit. His best claim to distinction was his seat in the House of Lords, but he had made no name for himself there. Moore, on the other hand, was the toast of London. Wined, dined, and feted, he was the intimate of statesmen, men of letters, and leaders of society. His home life with his wife Bessy was delightfully happy. His reputation as poet and patriot had spread around the globe. Meeting Byron could, therefore, be no more at the moment than a pleasant addition to an already full life.

Byron, who was eight years the junior, soon came to consider Moore as an adviser and showed a sincerity toward him that he did not always show more casual acquaintances. He perceived quickly that Moore had no sympathy with false poses. One evening, for example, Byron was trying to create an effect upon Moore by falling into a dark mood and hinting at mysterious and glamorous deeds in his past. Suddenly perceiving that Moore was having great difficulty to keep from laughing, he broke off this "romantic mystification" and never again tried it on his friend.<sup>9</sup> From such an incident it is quite

<sup>6</sup> John Russell, ed., *Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence of Thomas Moore* (London, 1853-56), II, 229.

<sup>7</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, II, 89.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 7.

<sup>9</sup> Russell, *op. cit.*, VIII, 423-24.



apparent why he once wrote to Lady Melbourne: "I am going to write a civil letter to such an one, a gallant letter to some one else, an ambitious one to another, and a sincere one to Tom Moore."<sup>10</sup> He knew Moore to be one of the few men who could "quiz" him, and soon referred to him as a "father confessor."<sup>11</sup>

During the remainder of his stay in England, Byron continued intimate with Moore and held him in the highest esteem. "I have had the kindest letter from Moore. I *do* think that man is the best-hearted, the only *hearted* being I ever encountered; and, then, his talents are equal to his feelings."<sup>12</sup> As he told Lady Blessington in later years, "My tête-à-tête suppers with Moore are among the most agreeable impressions I retain of the hours passed in London: they are the redeeming lights in the gloomy picture; but they were, 'Like angel-visits, few and far between.'"<sup>13</sup>

Their interchange of ideas soon began to bear fruit. Politically they were in agreement, and Moore, fostering the naturally democratic tendencies of Byron, probably directed the attention of the younger man to many issues which were interesting the progressives. In any event, Byron espoused with his pen and in Parliament the claims of the Roman Catholics for which Moore had fought during many years. He began to satirize the same political figures that are found in Moore's *Twopenny Post-Bag* and similar verse. In speaking of Byron's abhorrence of Castlereagh, R. E. Prothero said this dislike was "purely political, and probably, in its origin, due to Moore."<sup>14</sup> That many topics were common to their political satire is not hard to understand.

The parallelisms in their other literary efforts during these years are somewhat more curious. Certainly by September, 1811, Moore had begun work on an Oriental tale, eventually named *Lalla Rookh*, but the nature of the poem he kept a tight secret from everyone up to the time of publication. Byron knew only that Moore was at work on a long poem connected with the East and kept writing hearty words of encouragement. "Stick to the East. . . The little I have done in that way is merely a 'voice in the wilderness' for you; and if it has had any success, that also will prove that the public are orientalising, and pave the path for you."<sup>15</sup> No doubt the two poets had talked of the suitability of the East for poetic treatment, but Moore had not expected Byron to follow him into the Orient. He was considerably discouraged: "When I make my appearance, instead of being a leader

<sup>10</sup> Russell, *op. cit.*, V, 185.

<sup>11</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, III, 181.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 371.

<sup>13</sup> *A Journal of the Conversations of Lord Byron with the Countess of Blessington* (London, 1894), p. 292.

<sup>14</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, IV, 108.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 255.

as I looked to be, I must dwindle into a humble follower—a Byronian. This is disheartening."<sup>16</sup>

In a letter of August 13, 1813, to Moore, and under the impression that Moore was at work on an epic poem, Byron made the following suggestion:

I have been thinking of a story, grafted on the amours of a Peri and a mortal. . . . It would require a great deal of poesy, and tenderness is not my forte. For that, and other reasons, I have given up the idea, and merely suggest it to you, because, in intervals of your greater work, I think it a subject you might make much of.<sup>17</sup>

To this passage in Byron's letter, Moore affixed a footnote when he printed the letter in the biography of Byron: "I had already, singularly enough, anticipated this suggestion, by making the daughter of a Peri the heroine of one of my stories."<sup>18</sup> Moore was probably considerably agitated at the close harmony of thought between himself and Byron on the subject of Oriental themes for poetry, but wrote back advising Byron not to give up the subject of Peris on his account. However, he did ask Byron to let him know if the latter was proceeding on that subject, so that he could shift his own topic if necessary. With typical good humor, Byron replied: "Your Peri, my dear M., is sacred and inviolable; I have no idea of touching the hem of her petticoat."<sup>19</sup> Accordingly, instead of writing on Peris, Byron created another Eastern romance, entitled *The Bride of Abydos*. To Moore he wrote reassuringly: "I have scribbled another Turkish story. . . . It does not trench upon your kingdom in the least, and if it did, you would soon reduce me to my proper boundaries."<sup>20</sup> Later he added very sincerely: "I shall really be very unhappy if I at all interfere with you."<sup>21</sup> On reading *The Bride of Abydos*, Moore was filled with dismay:

Among the stories intended to be introduced into *Lalla Rookh*, which I had begun, but, from various causes, never finished, there was one which I had made some progress in, at the time of the appearance of *The Bride*, and which, on reading that poem, I found to contain such singular coincidences with it, not only in locality and costume, but in plot and characters, that I immediately gave up my story altogether, and began another on an entirely new subject—the Fire-worshippers.<sup>22</sup>

Byron was greatly disturbed over this mishap:

Your story I did not, could not, know,—I thought only of a Peri. I wish you had confided in me, not for your sake, but mine, and to prevent the world from

<sup>16</sup> Russell, *op. cit.*, VIII, 134.

<sup>17</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, II, 255.

<sup>18</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 256.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 293.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 302.

<sup>22</sup> Russell, *op. cit.*, II, 250.

losing a much better poem than my own, but which, I yet hope, this *clashing* will not even now deprive them of. Mine is the work of a week.<sup>23</sup>

Scant consolation for Moore. While working carefully and painstakingly to make up for "dash and vigour by a greater degree, if possible, of versatility and polish," he had the painful experience of seeing Byron put out tale after tale in rapid succession on topics close to his own. Of *The Bride of Abydos* he concluded dryly: "It would have been much finer if he had taken more time about it."<sup>24</sup>

Even though Moore discarded much of his poem that was akin to *The Bride of Abydos*, in all probability he did not cast aside the entire tale. Certain conspicuous likenesses still remain between Byron's poem and "The Fire-worshippers." In the former, Selim was at first secretly, later openly, chief of a pirate band warring against the Pasha Giaffir. Zuleika, loving him, experienced a struggle of soul between him and her father, the Pasha, who loved her dearly; but she finally decided in favor of Selim, and was with him when he died, waging single combat against the troops of the Pasha. Zuleika then died of grief. In "The Fire-worshippers" the general outlines are the same. Hinda, much beloved by her father, the Emir Al Hassan, fell in love with Hafed before she knew that he was the leader of the Ghebers, who were warring against her father. When she was captured by the Ghebers and found that Hafed was one of their number, she willingly threw in her lot with them. As Selim hid Zuleika in a cave at the time of combat, so did Hafed put Hinda out of harm's way when the final struggle approached. From a boat offshore, she watched the Ghebers, vastly outnumbered, wage their losing fight against Al Hassan and saw Hafed, last of his band, leap into the flames far above her to escape capture. More desperate than Zuleika, Hinda drowned herself. So even after Moore had made changes in his original story, the framework of the tales remained similar: the cruel father, dearly loving his daughter, is deserted by her in favor of an enemy chieftain, whom he strikes down before her very eyes. Moore's tale, however, is charged with allegory, for the parallel of the Ghebers and the Irish could not fail to suggest itself to Moore. Byron's mind had already been at work on that similarity, and he had called it specifically to Moore's attention in the preface to *The Corsair*: "The wrongs of your own country, the magnificent and fiery spirit of her sons, the beauty and feeling of her daughters, may there be found; and Collins, when he denominated his Oriental his Irish Eclogues, was not aware how true, at least, was a part of his parallel." This preface, by the way, which laid praise on Moore with a "golden trowel," was perhaps partially motivated by Byron's desire to avoid ill feeling with Moore over their curious selection of similar themes.

<sup>23</sup> Russell, *op. cit.*, II, 250.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 152.

During 1814 and 1815 Byron deserted his Eastern themes to invade a province which he had hitherto left entirely to Moore—the composition of words for music. The two poems entitled “Stanzas for Music” (“I speak not, I trace not, I breathe not thy name” and “There’s not a joy the world can give like that it takes away”) are definitely in the manner of Moore, a fact that Byron did not attempt to conceal. Of the latter poem, he wrote to Moore:

An event—the death of poor Dorset . . .—set me pondering, and finally into the train of thought which you have in your hands. I am very glad you like them, for I flatter myself they will pass as an imitation of your style. If I could imitate it well, I should have no great ambition of originality—I wish I could make you exclaim with Dennis, “That’s my thunder, by G-d!”<sup>25</sup>

Byron remained proud of these lines, set to music by Sir John Stevenson, who had also set many of the *Irish Melodies*, and once referred to them as “the truest, though the most melancholy” he ever wrote.

He continued working in this medium during the early months of 1815, and soon produced the volume entitled *Hebrew Melodies*. These poems, arranged for music by John Braham and Isaac Nathan, in variety of theme and in diction are akin to the *Irish Melodies*, but exhibit a stronger interest in biblical subjects, as indeed the title indicates. At this very time, however, Moore was hard at work on a set of religious lyrics, which appeared in 1816 as *Sacred Songs*. The parallelism in their writings thus progresses a step further as the two men turned simultaneously to writing religious lyrics to be set to music. Byron, however, was not encouraged by the reception of his volume to continue further in this medium. Moore, for one, twitted him considerably about it. Some of the lyrics, Moore thought, were poor, and the music, “‘Oh Lord God of Israel!’ What stuff it is!”<sup>26</sup> Byron chafed under the criticism.

The close relationship of the poets existed relatively unbroken up to the time of Byron’s departure from England. Byron’s marriage inevitably led to a greater separation of the men despite his reluctance that it should. Before and after his marriage he schemed constantly for some way in which he and Moore could see each other daily to interchange ideas and stimulate each other. Before his marriage he had rejected Moore’s suggestion of a trip to France and had urged Italy, where there would be fewer Englishmen:

“Let it be Rome, Milan, Naples, Florence, Turin, Venice, or Switzerland,” and “egad!” (as Bayes saith,) I will connubiate and join you; and we will write a new *Inferno* in our Paradise. Pray think of this—and I will really buy a wife and a ring, and say the ceremony, and settle near you in a summerhouse upon the Arno, or the Po, or the Adriatic.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, III, 183-84.

<sup>26</sup> *Notes from the Letters of Thomas Moore to his Music Publisher, James Power* . . . (New York, 1854), p. 43.

<sup>27</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, III, 65.

He had already explained to Moore his reasons for desiring such close intercourse:

I believe that most of our hates and likings have been hitherto nearly the same; but from henceforth they must, of necessity, be one and indivisible,—and now for it! I am for any weapon,—the pen, till one can find something sharper, will do for a beginning.<sup>28</sup>

Nothing immediate came of these schemes, but Byron did not forget them. After repairing to Italy, he wrote several times urging Moore to join him:

I will take a cottage a hundred yards to the south of your abode, and become your neighbour; and we will compose such canticles, and hold such dialogues, as shall be the terror of the *Times* (including the newspaper of that name), and the wonder, and honour, and praise, of the *Morning Chronicle* and posterity.<sup>29</sup>

His next idea was for them to write a newspaper jointly:

The project, then, is for you and me to set up jointly a *newspaper*—nothing more nor less—weekly, or so, with some improvement or modifications upon the plan of the present scoundrels, who degrade that department,—but a *newspaper*, which we will edit in due form, and, nevertheless, with some attention.

There must always be in it a piece of poesy from one or other of us *two*, leaving room, however, for such dilettanti rhymers as may be deemed worthy of appearing in the same column. . . . We will . . . give the age some new lights upon policy, poesy, biography, criticism, morality, theology, and all other *ism, ality, and ology* whatsoever.<sup>30</sup>

Moore responded that by coincidence he had been speculating upon the identical idea at that time. But despite their community of interest neither man took the steps necessary to bring the plan to fruition. Byron continued regretful:

Now, if we were but together a little to combine our *Journal of Trevoux!* But it is useless to sigh, and yet very natural,—for I think you and I draw better together, in the social line, than any two other living authors.<sup>31</sup>

The conclusion is inescapable from such a correspondence that Byron esteemed Moore not just as a social comrade, but as a friend and confidant with whom he could discuss harmoniously the *isms* and *ologies*. It is not difficult to understand, therefore, that Byron was willing to attempt certain forms of verse and modes of expression which Moore had already shown to be successful in their time in pleasing both the literary critics and the public. Their harmony of mind was most pronounced from 1811 until 1816, when Byron, about to leave England forever, said dolefully to Samuel Rogers: "Moore is coming, and you and he will be together, and I shall not be with you."<sup>32</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, III, 39.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 48.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 143.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 309.

<sup>32</sup> Russell, *op. cit.*, VIII, 213.

Following Byron's departure from England, the close intimacy of the poets was destroyed, even though they corresponded regularly and maintained their personal friendship unbroken until Byron's death. Furthermore, not only did their minds seek widely divergent channels, but Moore soon lost any ascendancy over Byron as a master of poetry. Hitherto, he had demonstrated great technique in two forms of poetry, satire and the lyric, which Byron himself had been eager to master. When Moore let it be known that he was at work on a long poem, Byron assumed it to be an epic, and desiring Moore now to show himself supreme in a third and greatest form of poetry, that form best befitting the greatest talents, he became greatly excited: "It may be, and would appear to a third person, an incredible thing, but I know *you* will believe me when I say, that I am as anxious for your success as one human being can be for another's,—as much as if I had never scribbled a line."<sup>83</sup> But when *Lalla Rookh* finally appeared, Byron, extremely disappointed in his expectations, could only say that Moore's reputation would have to rest upon the *Melodies*. For the first time, therefore, he felt disappointment in Moore's work, and that in the crucial moment when he believed Moore to be creating an epic that would crown his poetic efforts and perhaps set a mark for which Byron himself would shoot. Accordingly, Moore manifestly failed to maintain his leadership and left Byron to press on alone.

Nevertheless, at times their ways did cross. In occasional verse they often wrote on similar themes in a like manner. Shortly after Byron left England, for example, both produced poems on the death of Sheridan. Moore, on this occasion, struck off some of the most moving and powerful lines he ever wrote; Byron's effort, however, was desultory, as he wrote the poem at Kinnaid's suggestion rather than at the bidding of his own emotions. Also, quite by coincidence, both poets took a fling at despotic monarchy at the same time: Byron in *The Age of Bronze*, Moore in *Fables for the Holy Alliance*. Although alike in subject and tone, the two volumes are very different in structure: Byron's work consists of a single long poem, Moore's of a set of shorter verses. A third and extremely interesting parallel in their writing occurred around the turn of the year 1823. Many years before this date, at a time never definitely fixed, Moore had written a prose tale on the loves of three angels. Although eventually abandoning the tale, he never forgot it, and, when thrown heavily in debt by the dishonesty of his deputy in Bermuda, turned again to it as a means by which he might be able to meet his obligations. Starting in 1821, he had worked intermittently until the spring of 1822, when he received a considerable surprise. From Byron in Italy came a manuscript drama, entitled *Heaven and Earth*, which was based on the union of

<sup>83</sup> Prothero, *op. cit.*, II, 257.

angelic lovers with the daughters of men, exactly the same theme as that on which Moore was toiling. Despite feeling that it would be fatal for himself to appear after Byron, Moore decided to push on and

to publish my humble sketch immediately, with such alterations and additions as I had time to make, and thus, by an earlier appearance in the literary horizon, give myself the chance of what astronomers call an *heliocal rising*, before the luminary, in whose light I was to be lost, should appear.<sup>84</sup>

Accordingly, he set to work in earnest to turn his prose work into a poem. Expanded and altered in form, it came from the presses on December 23, 1822, as *Loves of the Angels*. Usually extremely slow at composition, Moore had executed his task at such a speed that he surprised even himself. Byron's manuscript, as it turned out, was held up through a series of delays and did not appear in print until eight days after Moore's. By virtue of their publication dates, the two productions were destined to be reviewed together, so that Moore's poem rose in the literary heavens with the very luminary he had feared. Oddly enough, the Moore poem was a considerable success, but the Byron drama, as Prothero says, "hardly escaped failure." Actually the two works do not belong in the same review. From a critical point of view, little that is instructive can be gained from citing parallelisms of content, and, as so little else exists in common between the works, the reviewers ordinarily had recourse to drawing extravagant contrasts between the poets themselves.

In the final analysis Moore seems to have exerted a powerful influence on Byron up to 1816, with the result that a surprising number of parallels occur between their writings. Both began publishing their poetry with the same kind of juvenile lyrics. Both then turned to satire, employing first the abusive, Juvenalian style of the eighteenth-century satirists, and then turning to a subtler, more piercing manner. Both then attempted simultaneously lyrics written for music, sacred songs, and tales of the East. Although the greater number of these parallelisms occurred before 1816, their occasional use of common themes after that date bears evidence that even then the two friends had not completely lost their harmony of mind.

*Michigan State Normal College*

<sup>84</sup> Preface to the *Loves of the Angels*.



## EMERSON, THE HISTORICAL FRAME, AND SHAKESPEARE

By THOMAS A. PERRY

Emerson is most familiar as a "romantic" critic, that is, as an exponent of the intuitive approach to the literary artist. The evidence, of course, quite generally supports this view of Emerson. His criticism of Shakespeare in particular is known for its rejection of historical research, and such passages as the following are considered representative:

I think, with all due respect to Aubrey, and Dyce, and Delia Bacon, and Judge Holmes, that it is not by discovery of contemporary documents, but by more cunning reading of the Book itself, that we shall at last eliminate the true biography of Shakspeare.<sup>1</sup>

However, a survey of Emerson's writings shows he did not reject permanently this idea of increasing the understanding of a literary work by scholarly research into the conditions out of which it arose.<sup>2</sup> The truer picture seems to be one of Emerson "inquisitive of all possible knowledge concerning Shakspeare," so that any aspect of his thought about Shakespeare cannot be discussed in terms of any one critical system. Instead, one may think of Emerson as meeting intermittently in historical research a compelling, though perhaps to him unattractive, force which he cannot ignore, and which ultimately he comes to desire to utilize. The historical method becomes one more approach to a work he seeks to understand, a method perhaps not inconsistent with other approaches.

Basic to an acceptance of historical research is the assumption that the work of the artist is, in part at least, the product of its age. Emerson's perennial interest in this problem of the relationship of art to its historical setting is evident as early as 1826, when Emerson was twenty-three and just out of college. In a letter to his Aunt Mary he says,

I have not forgiven Everett one speculative doctrine of the ΦBK oration, the more disagreeable, that I have found some reason to think it true,—to wit, that geniuses are the organs, mouthpieces of their age; do not speak their own words, nor think their own thoughts. It has occurred to me that, though we

<sup>1</sup> *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Riverside Edition (Boston, 1914), X, 279-80.

<sup>2</sup> Robert P. Falk, "Emerson and Shakespeare," *PMLA*, LVI (1941), 532-43, suggests that contradictory remarks in the Shakespearean criticism of Emerson are due to a "dualistic dilemma." Emerson is both a "transcendentalist" and a "realist"; as evidence of the latter, Falk refers to Emerson's interest in sources: "Emerson appears to anticipate the realistic school of Shakespearean criticism—even modern source-hunting scholarship."



think Shakspeare so singularly grand as to be a hermit in the fields of thought where he travels, yet we bind up in his volumes four or five plays of which the authorship is disputed betwixt him and certain unknown contemporaries. Other productions modern criticism has quoted from his time, bearing very respectable comparison with his own. So that the time, not the man, gave birth to this empyrean conceit.<sup>3</sup>

His distaste for the idea is no greater than his willingness to consider it.

The same problem again attracts Emerson's attention in his first essay on art (1841). However, he now finds it possible to continue giving credit to the role of the individual genius, while admitting the importance of the historical setting; the idea, once offensive, is no longer so.

But the artist must employ the symbols in use in his day and nation to convey his enlarged sense to his fellow-men. Thus the new in art is always formed out of the old. . . . As far as the spiritual character of the period overpowers the artist and finds expression in his work, so far it will retain a certain grandeur, and will represent to future beholders the Unknown, the Inevitable, the Divine. No man can quite exclude this element of Necessity from his labor. No man can quite emancipate himself from his age and country, or produce a model in which the education, the religion, the politics, usages and arts of his times shall have no share. Though he were never so original, never so wilful and fantastic, he cannot wipe out of his work every trace of the thoughts amidst which it grew. The very avoidance betrays the usage he avoids. Above his will and out of his sight he is necessitated by the air he breathes and the idea on which he and his contemporaries live and toil, to share the manner of his times, without knowing what that manner is.<sup>4</sup>

Three years later, in "The Poet," there is a passage in the same vein.

The poet has a new thought; he has a whole new experience to unfold; he will tell us how it was with him, and all men will be the richer in his fortune. *For the experience of each new age requires a new confession* [italics mine] and the world seems always waiting for its poet.<sup>5</sup>

In "Shakspeare; or, the Poet" (1850) Emerson is willing to say that "Great men are more distinguished by range and extent than by originality . . . no great men are original. . . . The hero is in the press of knights and the thick of events. . . . The greatest genius is the most indebted man." He traces the history of the stage and states the influence of stage traditions upon Shakspeare. Moreover, he points out,

The rude warm blood of the living England circulated in the play, as in street-ballads, and gave body which he wanted to his airy and majestic fancy. The poet needs a ground in popular tradition on which he may work, and which, again, may restrain his art within the due temperance. It holds him to the people,

<sup>3</sup> *Journals*, II, 100-01.

<sup>4</sup> *Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, with a Biographical Introduction and Notes, by Edward Waldo Emerson, Riverside Edition (Boston, 1903-1904), II, 352-53.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 10.

supplies a foundation for his edifice, and in furnishing so much work done to his hand, leaves him at leisure and in full strength for the audacities of his imagination. In short, the poet owes to his legend what sculpture owed to the temple. . . . As soon as the statue was begun for itself, and with no reference to the temple or palace, the art began to decline. . . . This balance-wheel, which the sculptor found in architecture, the perilous irritability of poetic talent found in the accumulated dramatic materials to which the people were already wonted, and which had a certain excellence which no single genius, however extraordinary, could hope to create.<sup>6</sup>

Again, he says,

. . . he [the Genius] finds himself in the river of thoughts and events, forced onward by the ideas and necessities of his contemporaries. He stands where all the eyes of men look one way, and their hands all point in the direction in which he should go.

But, though he grants, even emphasizes, the importance of historical setting to the artist, he cannot bring himself to concede much to historical research. In fact, he seems to waver as to the degree to which he will go in acknowledging the role of such research. He expresses gratitude to the

. . . antiquaries, and the Shakspeare Society, for ascertaining the steps of the English drama . . . down to the possession of the stage by the very pieces which Shakspeare altered, remodelled and finally made his own.

He is interested in Malone's work on Shakespeare's use of sources: "Malone's sentence is an important piece of external history." He admits

. . . the importance of this information [biographical information about Shakespeare]. It was well worth the pains that have been taken to procure it.

However, in the very next passage he qualifies his statement:

But whatever scraps of information concerning his conditions these researches may have rescued, they can shed no light upon that infinite invention which is the concealed magnet of his attraction for us.<sup>7</sup>

Unless one takes notice of other similar concessions by Emerson to historical research, he is likely to think that Emerson is merely being graciously tolerant of a futile scholarship.<sup>8</sup>

The subject comes up once more in the second essay on art (1870):

Another deduction from the genius of the artist is what is conventional in his art, of which there is much in every work of art. Thus how much is there that

<sup>6</sup> *Works*, IV, 189.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 193-95, 191, 201.

<sup>8</sup> The following passage, also from "Shakspeare," is still stronger in minimizing the importance of external biography: "Shakspeare is the only biographer of Shakspeare; and even he can tell nothing, except to the Shakspeare in us, that is, to our most apprehensive and sympathetic hour. . . . Read the antique documents extricated, analyzed and compared by the assiduous Dyce and Collier, and now read one of these skyey sentences,—aerolites,—which seem to have fallen out of heaven . . . and tell me if they match; if the former account in any manner for the latter; or which gives the most historical insight into the man."

is not original in every particular building, in every statue, in every tune, painting, poem, or harangue!—whatever is national or usual; as the usage of building all Roman churches in the form of a cross. . . . Yet who will deny that the merely conventional part of the performance contributes much to its effect?<sup>9</sup>

Obviously it is possible to accept this thesis that a work of art is indebted to its age, without granting the importance of historical research. In fact, as we have already shown, Emerson in his essay on Shakespeare seems to do just this. It is even possible to place the emphasis on reading the masterpiece to understand the age, as Emerson occasionally does.

One of these six hours every day I would give to history So go get Hume, (not the Vol. I) but the reign of Elizabeth & if your sister E will begin it with you, so much the better for both. . . . After finishing Hume from that reign you will find yourself sufficiently interested in English Story to go back to Henry VIII. Read at the same time Shakspears fine play of that name & then you will be ready to take up Robertson's Charles V, who was contemporary with Harry.<sup>10</sup>

On the other hand, this thesis—that the artist and his work are the products of their times—is the basic assumption of the scholar who approaches the artist within his historical frame. Is it not possible, then, that Emerson, granting this thesis though as yet unwilling to make much concession to historical research, would at some time, in his desire to know all that is possible concerning Shakespeare, not only accept this approach, but even desire to make use of it? There is evidence that he did.

First, he grants the usefulness of contemporaries in shedding light on the great Elizabethans.

. . . in the Elizabethan era he [the reader] is at the richest period of the English mind, with the chief men of action and of thought which that nation has produced. . . . Here he has Shakspeare, Spenser, Sidney, Raleigh, Bacon, Chapman, Jonson. . . .

Then, recommending the works of Bacon for the light they shed on that age, Emerson continues,

The task is aided by the strong mutual light which these men shed on each other. Thus, the works of Ben Jonson are a sort of hoop to bind all these fine

<sup>9</sup> *Works*, VII, 45. There are other scattered passages throughout the *Journals* and essays which show Emerson's continued interest in this subject; for instance: "Homer, Chaucer, Shakspeare, and Raphael, have obviously no limits to their works except the limits of their lifetime, and resemble a mirror carried through the street, ready to render an image of every created thing" ("The Poet" [1847], *Works*, III, 41). "So live the thoughts of Shakspear. They have a necessary being. They live like men. To such productions it is obviously necessary that they should take that form which is then alive before the poet. The playhouse must have been the daily resort of Shakspear and that profession on which his circumstances had concentrated his attention" (*Journals*, IV, 35).

<sup>10</sup> Letter to Hannah Haskins Ladd in 1824. Ralph L. Rusk, ed. *Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (New York, 1939), I, 155-56. In "Books" (1870) Emerson says, "English history is best known through Shakspeare."

persons together, and to the land to which they all belong. He has written verses to or on all his notable contemporaries; and what with so many occasional poems, and the portrait sketches in his Discoveries, and the gossiping record of his opinions in his conversations with Drummond of Hawthornden, he has really illustrated the England of his time.<sup>11</sup>

This is one kind of historical approach to Spenser, Sidney, Raleigh, Shakespeare, and other Elizabethans.

More important still, in the same essay Emerson describes a model literary club to sift out the best reading, one group of members devoting themselves to Shakespearean and early historical scholarship.

. . . it would be well for sincere young men to borrow a hint from the French Institute and the British Association, and as they divide the whole body into sections, each of which sits upon and reports of certain matters confided to it, so let each scholar associate himself to such persons as he can rely on, in a literary club, in which each shall undertake a single work or series for which he is qualified. For example, how attractive is the whole literature of the Roman de la Rose, the Fabliaux, and the *gaie science* of the French Troubadours. . . . Another member meantime shall as honestly search, sift and as truly report on British mythology, the Round Table, the histories of Brut, Merlin and Welsh poetry; a third on the Saxon Chronicles, Robert of Gloucester and William of Malmesbury; a fourth, on Mysteries, Early Drama, Gesta Romanorum, *Collier, and Dyce, and the Camden Society* [italics mine].<sup>12</sup>

In this model club of scholars, one group would be concerned with the history of English drama; recommended to them are the best known research scholars in the life and times of Shakespeare. It is also significant that Emerson, as we shall show later, was himself well informed on the progress of such historical research. It is still more significant that Emerson's reading, previous to the writing of his lecture (and essay) on Shakespeare, corresponds closely to the suggestions made here.

But Emerson traveled still farther in the direction of the historical method. The nondramatic verse of Shakespeare never was very clear to him. As early as 1834 one senses this fact in his *Journal*:

But how remarkable every way are Shakspear's sonnets. Those addressed to a beautiful young man seem to show some singular friendship amounting almost to a passion which probably excited his youthful imagination. They are invaluable for the hints they contain respecting his unknown self.<sup>13</sup>

That he is not completely satisfied with his understanding of the poems becomes more evident in another entry in the *Journal*, in 1864.

The Sonnets intimate the old Aristotelian Culture, and a poetic Culture that we do not easily understand whence it came,—smacks of the Middle Ages and parliaments of love and poesy. . . .<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> In "Books" (1870), *Works*, VII, 207. See also *Journals*, III, 211.

<sup>12</sup> *Works*, VII, 220-21.

<sup>13</sup> *Journals*, III, 290.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, X, 30.

The climax is reached in the Preface to *Parnassus* (1874). There Emerson is willing to put into practice "historical research" to help him understand these poems.

I should like to have the Academy of Letters propose a prize for an essay on Shakspeare's poem, "*Let the bird of loudest lay*," and the "*Threnos*" with which it closes; the aim of the essay being to explain, by a historical research into the poetic myths and tendencies of the age in which it was written, the frame and allusions of the poem. . . . To unassisted readers, it would appear to be a lament on the death of a poet, and of his poetic mistress. But the poem is so quaint, and charming in diction, tone, and allusions, and in its perfect metre and harmony, that I would gladly have the fullest illustration yet attainable.<sup>15</sup>

One might at this point recall that Emerson discussed the sonnets with Collier, the Shakespearean scholar, during his visit to England in May, 1848.<sup>16</sup> Insofar as Emerson's interest was concerned, in this passage from *Parnassus* the pendulum had swung as far as it could toward the historical method.<sup>17</sup>

In the light of all these facts, which have shown a relatively unfamiliar aspect of Emerson's approach to Shakespeare, it is well to point out that Emerson was not only well informed regarding contemporary Shakespearean historical scholarship, but he was also well read about the Elizabethan world in which Shakespeare lived and wrote. (It is possible Emerson himself was often unaware of the total contribution of such reading to his understanding of Shakespeare.)

In a letter to Christopher Gore Ripley, who was to speak on "Inquiries into the History and Character of Shakspeare" as his part in the Harvard graduating exercises of 1841, Emerson quotes, apparently from memory,<sup>18</sup> a reading list which includes not only essays by Goethe, Coleridge, *et al.*, but also the "few volumes which contain the few material facts"—the Prolegomena to Malone's edition of Shakespeare, particularly for the personal history of the dramatist and for a history of the English stage; the articles by Collier and Dyce in the *London Quarterly* and *Westminster Review*; and Wotton, Aubrey, and the allusions of Jonson and Greene. Emerson expresses regret that there is not more information. He gives praise to

<sup>15</sup> *Parnassus*, edited by Ralph Waldo Emerson (Boston, 1875), pp. v-vi. Note Emerson's use of the word *frame*.

<sup>16</sup> *Letters*, IV, 66.

<sup>17</sup> One may remember that historical scholarship in literature was often very inaccurate, and in the case of Delia Bacon and Judge Holmes fantastic, during the early nineteenth century. Its reputation in America was established later in the century; Francis J. Child's *Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser* (1855), *Observations on the Language of Chaucer* (1863), *Observations on the Language of Gower's Confessio Amantis* (1873) would have increased the respect for such scholarship. Lowell's friendship and admiration for Child (*vide* his letters and the dedication to *My Study Windows*) came in the 1860's and 1870's. However, one should also remember the earlier interest in German scholarship, and the friendship between Emerson and William H. Furness, historical scholar of the Bible and father of H. H. Furness.

<sup>18</sup> *Letters*, I, xxxiii; II, 424, 425.

Malone's Prolegomena, and is interested enough in the "slender external evidence" by Collier and Dyce that Shakespeare had been a schoolteacher "that I wish you may find it to be something more than a guess."

Malone's Shakespeare was borrowed by Emerson from both the Harvard Library and the Boston Athenaeum, the Prolegomena twice in 1835.<sup>19</sup> These volumes, it will be recalled, contain, besides the information listed by Emerson, documents about Shakespeare and his family, entries in the Stationers' Register, and contemporary allusions to Shakespeare. Volume XX of Malone's edition was borrowed by Emerson from the Athenaeum in 1838.<sup>20</sup> This volume contains the nondramatic verse of Shakespeare, about which Emerson was so curious. In it are extensive notes giving as much of the "frame" of these poems as was known, and the *Memoirs of Southampton*. A copy of Aubrey was in Emerson's own library.<sup>21</sup>

Of special significance is Emerson's borrowing from Longfellow in December, 1845, of nine volumes of the Shakespeare Society Publications—"the only ones of the series, which seem to contain much about the great bard and his times"—when Emerson must already have been at work on his lecture about Shakespeare.<sup>22</sup> Which volumes were sent Emerson is not mentioned, but publications of the Society up to 1845 include the *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, the *Alleyn Papers*, *Extracts from the Accounts of Revels at Court*, Ben Jonson's *Conversations with Drummond*, Gosson's *School of Abuse*, Heywood's *Apology for Actors*, *Illustrations of the Fairy Mythology of Shakespeare*, *Merry Wives of Windsor* and its sources, *First Sketches of 2 and 3 Henry VI*, *True Tragedie of Richard III*, *Sir Thomas More*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, and reprints of some of the mystery plays.

A look at Emerson's essay on Shakespeare shows use of such reading. He refers to the researches of the Shakespeare Society, to the history of the drama, to Shakespeare's will, to law suits, to the property of Shakespeare, to Shakespeare's share in Blackfriars, to the schoolteacher tradition.<sup>23</sup> He gives details regarding Malone's "laborious computations" on the sources of the Henry VI trilogy. Whether used to deny their importance or whether they contribute something to Emerson's understanding of Shakespeare, these bits of information show Emerson's acquaintance with historical research.

The historical approach can also be made through the writings of contemporaries, or through a knowledge of contemporary history. Emerson was well read regarding the Elizabethan social, political, and literary worlds. His *Quotation Book* (1820-1821) suggests he had

<sup>19</sup> Kenneth Walter Cameron, *Ralph Waldo Emerson's Reading* (Raleigh, North Carolina, 1941), pp. 22, 48.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>21</sup> *Letters*, II, 426.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 313.

<sup>23</sup> *Works*, IV, 201 ff., 204 ff.

already read Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*, Harrison's *Description of England* in Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Camden's *Annals*, and Ben Jonson's *Discoveries*. He also shows familiarity with Bacon's letters to the Earl of Devonshire on the Essex affair. In the same book, secondary sources quoted on the Elizabethan Age are Warton and Southey.<sup>24</sup> Subsequent reading recorded in the *Journals* includes Raleigh's *History of the World*, Camden's *Britannia*, Campion's *History of Ireland*, Hakluyt's *Voyages*, Purchas' *Pilgrimages*, Fuller's *Worthies*, Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*, *A Relation... of the Island of England by a Venetian Traveller* (ca. 1500), Polydore Vergil's *Historia Anglica*, and Hume's *History of England on the Tudors*.<sup>25</sup> References to Aubrey and Wotton are too numerous to list here.

A glance back at Emerson's essay on Shakespeare shows that he made use of the information he gathered by such reading. He discusses the Puritan opposition to the theater. He is conscious of the political ferment, and the relation of Elizabethan drama to that ferment. He is familiar with the development of the public playhouse. Briefly he sketches part of the social background for Elizabethan drama.

Shakespeare's youth fell in a time when the English people were importunate for dramatic entertainments. The court took offence easily at political allusions and attempted to suppress them. The Puritans, a growing and energetic party, and the religious among the Anglican church, would suppress them. Inn-yards, houses without roofs, and extemporaneous enclosures at country fairs were the ready theatres of strolling players.<sup>26</sup>

We know where Emerson learned about Elizabethan society—from the reading listed in the *Journals* for the late 1840's and the publications of the Shakespeare Society. And such passages are introductory to what Emerson has to say about "Shakspeare, the Man" and "Shakspeare, the Poet." May one not say that Emerson's intuitive approach to Shakespeare was aided by knowledge of Shakespeare's age?

After an examination of Emerson's statements about the historical frame, of his reading, and of his utilization of that reading, it seems logical to conclude that the historical approach was not as unnatural to Emerson as has been thought. Of course, this is but one part of the picture of Emerson, but it has been a much neglected one, and it needs to be pointed out. Emerson is intermittently concerned with the artist in his historical frame, even to the point of recognizing the usefulness of the historical approach for a more nearly complete understanding of the artist and his work.

Central College, Fayette, Mo.

<sup>24</sup> Emerson was not yet twenty. *Journals*, I, 86 ff.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 89; VII, 369, 563. See also Cameron, *op. cit.*, pp. 62, 99. Notice that the greater number of these books were being read in 1847 and 1848. The essay on Shakespeare was printed in 1850.

<sup>26</sup> *Works*, IV, 191.



## A STUDY OF THE PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN DIALECT SPOKEN IN THE COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND BERKS\*

By CARROLL E. REED and LESTER W. SEIFERT

### A. THE PLAN

The initial investigation of Pennsylvania German utilizing the methods of linguistic geography was begun in 1939 under the direction of Dr. Hans Kurath, then of Brown University. It was not the first attempt to study this dialect, however, inasmuch as it had received repeated attention from scholars ever since Samuel S. Haldeman's<sup>1</sup> small treatise appeared in 1872. But none of the previous investigators had concerned themselves with the regional aspects within the areas occupied by speakers of Pennsylvania German, even though some of them recognized the need for such an approach to the problem.<sup>2</sup>

It has long been known that Pennsylvania German resembles the dialects of the Rhenish Palatinate more closely than it does any others, and Buffington<sup>3</sup> has shown that it is today closest to the speech of the eastern Palatinate, but he has also made it clear that other dialects of southwestern Germany have left their traces in Pennsylvania German. A great deal of research has been done on the dialects of the entire Rhine Valley,<sup>4</sup> particularly in the field of linguistic geography. For this reason, Pennsylvania German lends itself well to investigation as a colonial dialect. Moreover, both the population history and the cultural history of the Pennsylvania Germans themselves are fairly well recorded.

One of the first historical accounts of the Pennsylvania Germans

\* Cf. *Modern Language Quarterly*, VIII (1947), 267 ff., and IX (1948), 322 ff.

<sup>1</sup> S. S. Haldeman, *Pennsylvania Dutch: A Dialect of South German with an Infusion of English* (London, 1872).

<sup>2</sup> M. D. Learned, *The Pennsylvania German Dialect* (Baltimore, 1889). After writing of the different dialects spoken by the early Pennsylvania German settlers, Learned continues: "Nor must it be supposed that, inasmuch as the Pennsylvania German is spoken of as a unit, such a complete leveling has taken place as to render it impossible to trace the original dialectal characteristics" (p. 19). "A more detailed treatment of dialectal differences is reserved for a subsequent chapter" (p. 22). That "subsequent chapter" never appeared, although he refers to this matter again in the *American Ethnological Survey, Conestoga Expedition 1902* (New York, 1911). Following the example of Wenker in Germany, Learned wants to construct a Dialect Map (cf. page 5 of the Preliminary Report) and also compile a dialect dictionary (p. 1). Neither of these plans was carried out.

<sup>3</sup> A. F. Buffington, *Pennsylvania German: A Grammatical and Linguistic Study of the Dialect* (Harvard University diss., 1937), (typescript). Cf. also his article "Pennsylvania German: Its Relation to other German Dialects," *American Speech*, XIV (1939), 276-86.

<sup>4</sup> The dialects of the Rhine Province have been studied quite thoroughly, and considerable attention has also been given to those of southwestern Germany.



was written by Dr. Benjamin Rush,<sup>5</sup> who in 1789 emphasized the valuable contributions made by these people as pioneers in America. From that time until the present, the more educated Pennsylvania Germans have manifested scholarly interest in the history and folklore of their people, and in the last few decades this interest has achieved such widespread popular appeal that numerous historical societies have been formed in the various localities of southeastern Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania German Society was organized at an early date and is still very active. The much more recent Pennsylvania German Folklore Society has well justified its existence by its excellent annual publications. Such records, by their illumination of the various cultural characteristics within the Pennsylvania German settlement area, have contributed substantially to the study of corresponding linguistic peculiarities.

Most investigators who have studied the dialect treated it as if it were quite homogeneous, although some of them mentioned briefly the existence of differences. Others made vague references to regional variants which they had noticed, but they occupied themselves primarily with the homogeneous nature of the dialect—as they saw it—and ignored the significance of regional distribution.<sup>6</sup> The present

<sup>5</sup> B. Rush, *An Account of the Manners of the German Inhabitants of Pennsylvania*, ed. by I. D. Rupp (Philadelphia, 1789).

<sup>6</sup> S. S. Haldeman, *op. cit.*, writes on page 4: "The early settlers were extensive purchasers and occupiers of land, and being thus widely scattered, and having but few good roads, the uniformity of the language is greater than might have been supposed possible." On the next page, he mentions the fact that his study is based upon the speech of Lancaster County, but no further reference is made to dialect differences.

M. B. Lambert, in the Introduction to his *Dictionary of the Non-English Words of the Pennsylvania-German Dialect* (Lancaster, Pa., 1924), writes: "The Swiss admixture is only slightly noticeable in the eastern part of the section, but is very evident in the Lancaster-York district. . . . The constant intermingling of those speaking different dialects has had a smoothing-out and leveling effect, so that the Pennsylvania-German dialect is quite homogeneous"; on page xii of the Introduction, after reviewing the spellings so far used in writing the dialect, he says: "I have gone into detail to show the anarchy that has reigned in this field, although the pronunciation is fairly uniform throughout"; in the dictionary itself, moreover, all dialect differences of geographical significance are disregarded, as in the case of the words for "the meadow," i.e., *schwamm*—*wiss*/*wies*.

A. F. Buffington, *op. cit.*, page 11, writes of "the composite Pennsylvania German dialect (with certain local and individual variations) . . . yet, on the whole, the dialectal variations . . . in the various sections of Pennsylvania are very slight." Consequently he does not go into this matter very deeply, but his remarks upon the subject, despite their limitations, are trustworthy.

On February 3 and 10, 1940, there appeared an article in the *Allentown Morning Call* ("S Pennsylvawisch Deutsch Eck," ed. by P. Barba) by J. W. Frey, under the title "The Pennsylvania German Dialect in York County." Since he limits himself to the discussion of the dialect spoken in a certain region, it is evident that he recognizes the presence of differences between York County and other regions. In the article, however, Mr. Frey gives a general treatment of some of the grammatical features of the York County dialect, but he does not say in which of these forms the dialect of York County differs from the dialects of other regions.

study, then, was undertaken in order to investigate whether this dialect was actually as uniform as previously supposed and whether the variable element had any valid significance. For our purposes, a newly developed scientific technique was available, that of Linguistic Geography.<sup>7</sup>

From historical accounts it is known that the German settlers of eastern Pennsylvania could not all have originally spoken the same dialect: there were Palatines, Swiss, Württembergers, Hessians, Alsatians, and some other minor groups. Moreover, these groups were not evenly mixed, since in some regions the Palatines were predominant, in others the Swiss, and in still others the Württembergers. It is only natural to suppose that the native dialect of a group which is predominant in a certain region would more strongly color the newly arising common dialect, within that region, than in other regions. Hence, a geographical study of the dialect according to strict statistical controls (i.e., with use of a standard questionnaire, and with selection of informants from given cultural, social, and age groups) seemed to recommend itself.

#### B. COLLECTION OF MATERIAL

Linguistic geography differs from the other branches of linguistics in three important ways: (1) the type of material it uses, (2) the method of collecting its material, and (3) the method of interpreting the linguistic data at its disposal. The linguistic geographer goes into the field and records specimens of the language as it is actually spoken; literary texts are only a secondary source of information. In order to have points of comparison, he must record the same items for all of his informants. The only way in which he can hope to do this is by using a definitely established workbook, or questionnaire, in each of his interviews. Such a workbook is an absolute prerequisite for any field work which has as its goal the ascertaining of regional, social, and age distribution of linguistic data.<sup>8</sup>

The selection of the items included in a workbook depends upon the purpose of the study to be undertaken. In the present study, there was a twofold purpose: (1) to investigate the *variable* as well as the *common* features of pronunciation and of morphology, and (2) to sample the *variable* element in the vocabulary. We say "to sample," for, since the vocabulary does not constitute a system, we could not hope for completeness; that is the business of the lexicographer. Thus, our method of approach was one of selection and evaluation.

<sup>7</sup> Preparation for the study was made under the direct tutelage of Dr. Hans Kurath, director and editor of the *Linguistic Atlas of New England*.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. H. Kurath, *Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England* (Providence, R.I., 1939), for a discussion of the methods and aims of linguistic geography and for a bibliography of this subject.

We included a considerable body of *common* vocabulary, for, in order to establish the *common* as well as the *variable* elements in pronunciation and morphology, we had to choose lexical items for which we had reason to believe no variation would occur.

With these aims in mind we began to construct our workbook, the procedure for which was as follows:

(1) We read and analyzed as much of the Pennsylvania German literature as we could. From this we collected a large body of items which illustrated the phonemic and morphologic patterns of the language. When we found variations in the vocabulary, these were also noted. In matters of grammatical structure especially, we drew very heavily upon Buffington's excellent dissertation.<sup>9</sup> Then we carefully selected items from our collection to give a complete picture of the phonemic system and a bare outline of the morphology of the language.

(2) We collected another body of material from the *Sprachatlas*,<sup>10</sup> from Kretschmer's *Wortgeographie*,<sup>11</sup> and particularly from the monographs and papers dealing with the dialects of the Palatinate, Württemberg, Baden, Switzerland, and Hesse-Darmstadt. From this collection, those items were selected which have a restricted geographic distribution in Germany. In this way we hoped to be able to point out the survival of non-Palatine elements in Pennsylvania German.

(3) The third step was to combine and arrange the two bodies of material which we had selected from our larger collection. The items from both of these were arranged topically in order that the attention of the informants might be directed toward the subject matter rather than toward linguistic forms—an essential detail in obtaining natural responses during an interview. The main topics were arranged in this sequence: (1) House and Home; (2) The Farm; (3) Utensils and Dishes; (4) Vehicles, Implements, and Crops; (5) Animals; (6) Vegetables and Fruits; (7) Meat and Drink; (8) Trees and Flowers; (9) Small Life; (10) Topography; (11) Business Activities; (12) The Body; (13) Clothing; (14) Illnesses; (15) Personal Attributes; (16) The Family; (17) Social Affairs; (18) The Emotions; (19) The Weather; (20) Seasons and Time; (21) Numerals; (22) Miscellany.

After the field work had begun, and as we learned more and more of the language, the workbook underwent a few minor revisions. We added some new items on the basis of suggestions offered by informants and dropped a few which we found either useless for our purposes or almost impossible to elicit from our informants. As time

<sup>9</sup> Cited in note 3 above.

<sup>10</sup> F. Wrede, *Deutscher Sprachatlas* (Marburg, 1926).

<sup>11</sup> P. Kretschmer, *Wortgeographie der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache* (Göttingen, 1918).

goes on and new exigencies arise, more revisions, of course, will be undertaken.

When the questionnaire was finished, it was necessary to decide in what regions of the Pennsylvania German area recordings should first be made. The decision was as follows: Mr. Reed was to work in the western part of Berks County, in that part of the Schuylkill River watershed which is known as the Lebanon Valley; Mr. Seifert was to work in the western part of Lehigh County, in the western part of the Lehigh Valley, which lies between the Blue and the Lehigh (or South) mountains. A distance of approximately fifty miles separates the two regions. The choosing of these locations was influenced by the following conditions: (1) Berks and Lehigh are known as two of the counties where Pennsylvania German is still spoken by the great majority of the inhabitants; (2) the Lebanon Valley and the Lehigh Valley, by reason of their fertility and advantageous geographic position, must be areas from which linguistic features radiate to the outlying territories; (3) by reason of their different settlement histories, it was to be expected that contrasting linguistic features would radiate from these areas. Reed then located at Charming Forge, near Womelsdorf, and Seifert went to Fogelsville. From these bases the investigation was extended into the surrounding countryside. For reasons of economy, the areas were traversed by bicycle, a fact which somewhat limited the distance which could be covered.

The field work was done in two separate areas located some distance apart in order that we might obtain some idea of the amount of variation in the dialect from section to section. We were also interested in discovering how much it varied from community to community, from family to family, within two such separated areas. To this end it was necessary to record a fairly large number of informants within a comparatively small region. Since the initial work was only the first step in carrying out the plan of a much larger and more complete survey—namely, a *Dialect Atlas* of the entire Pennsylvania German area—we thus obtained valuable information in deciding upon the number of points to be investigated in the entire area and the number of informants to be interviewed in each locality.

Thus, although the body of material now available for study is necessarily incomplete, it is larger in many ways than that which any other investigator has had at his disposal. Nevertheless, our investigations have revealed notably striking features which should be brought to the attention of other scholars, and thus provide the basis for an entirely new method of dealing with Pennsylvania German.

### C. THE GERMAN SETTLEMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The colonization of the Pennsylvania German areas here investigated had its initial impetus long before the first settlement, German-

town, was founded by Pastorius in 1683. Unsettled political, religious, and social conditions in southwestern Germany, accentuated by the ravages of the Thirty Years' War and subsequent disasters, had reduced a large number of Germans to the most wretched state of social and economic insecurity. The appearance of William Penn in Germany and the security which he had to offer in a new land of opportunity, therefore, acted as a stimulus for the extensive migration of peoples which was to follow. It was with the collaboration of Penn that groups of Quakers and allied sects within Germany organized the "Crefeld Purchasers" and the "Frankfurt Land Company." These purchasers made up the bulk of the Germans who settled at Germantown in 1683. Most of them came from Kriegsheim (near Darmstadt), Crefeld (north of Cologne), and Sommerhausen—strong Quaker centers in Germany.

In the next year a group of about forty people, led by Kelpius, came to Germantown. They comprised a religious sect known as "The Awakened" and emigrated largely from Württemberg, around Bietigheim on the Neckar River.

Between the years 1704 and 1712, the first white settlements in Berks County were made. These were composed of English Friends, French Huguenots, and Germans. Most of the latter, said to have come from the Palatinate, settled near Wahlenk (Oley) in the southeastern part of the present Berks County.

In 1712 a group of Mennonites bought land on the Pequea Creek in the present Lancaster County. They had left their homes in the Swiss cantons of Zürich, Bern, and Schaffhausen in 1672 and settled in Alsace, especially along the Rhine above Strassburg. In 1708 they had gone to England under the protection of Queen Anne, and from there proceeded to America, settling first in Germantown, and then in the Pequea Valley. They were followed by others, both Swiss and Germans, particularly in the years between 1712 and 1717.

Other settlements which emanated from Germantown in those early days were the German Reformed group which located at Goshoppen in 1717, and the group of Low German Mennonites who settled by the waters of the Perkiomen and the Skipack in 1734.

#### THE LEHIGH AREA

Lehigh County was at one time part of Northampton County, which in turn was originally a part of Bucks County. Northampton County, established in 1752, was first settled by Ulster Scots, or "Scotch-Irish," and Welsh (the latter having settled in Lynn Township as early as 1735, although they were largely supplanted by Germans as early as 1756). From about 1720 on, the first German settlers came up the Delaware River, entered the West Branch—or the Lehigh River—and took up land to the south of this Branch, on Saucony

Creek. Many of them were Baptists and Mennonites. Later there arrived a group of Moravians, who began to build Bethlehem in 1741 and set up a church at Emaus in 1742; most of these people, though recently from Germany, had spent a short time in Georgia, where they had attempted to form a settlement in 1734.

Gradually, the increasing numbers of German settlers supplanted the Scotch-Irish in the greater part of the county. The Germans seem to have settled in an ever-increasing radius around Bethlehem, principally to the south, most of them moving in from Bucks County. A number of Dunkards, Mennonites, and Amish came in from Montgomery County at an early date and settled near Faulkner Swamp. The southern tip of the county (now part of Lehigh County) was settled by Schwenkfelders.

Throughout the following years, the Germans in Lehigh County penetrated ever farther into the more outlying districts. Although much of this colonization proceeded in a northerly and northwesterly direction, there was, at the same time, considerable expansion from Berks County. Kutztown, in Berks County, was established in 1733. This represents a comparatively early settlement, which spread eastward towards Lehigh County and northward in Berks County.

#### THE TULPEHOCKEN AREA

One of the earliest settlements in Berks County, and the first large German settlement, was made by a group of "Palatines" who had gone to England in 1708-9 with the ultimate hope of reaching America. They were sent to New York in 1710 to make turpentine for the British Government. When this venture failed, they moved to Schoharie, New York, and remained there for about ten years. In 1723 most of them migrated down the Susquehanna River, up the Swatara Creek, and took up land along the Tulpehocken. They were followed by others in 1729, under the leadership of Conrad Weiser, who made his residence near the present borough of Womelsdorf. This settlement constituted a rather distinct group, residing mainly in western Berks County, but also in part of the present Lebanon County. The villages now known as Womelsdorf and Stouchsburg provided a cultural center which is maintained as such even to the present day. Gradually, the Germans in the Tulpehocken area were augmented by new immigrants who came up the Schuylkill Valley from Philadelphia. A few Swiss settled in Bern Township; Low Germans first established the city of Hamburg, but were soon outnumbered by people from the Palatinate, and in 1748 Reading was founded by people from Württemberg and the Palatinate.

The Germans along the Tulpehocken had other German neighbors to the south and west of them. In 1719 a number of Dunkards from Schwarzenau came to Philadelphia, and some of these went, by way



of Lancaster County, to Mill Creek, which lies within the present bounds of Lebanon County, adjacent to Berks County. In 1729 a number of German Jews settled not far from here in Scheafferstown, Lebanon County, and built a synagogue. The city of Lebanon was founded by George Steitz in 1750, but a number of German families are known to have been located around Lebanon as early as 1723. The road to Lebanon from Lancaster County, by way of Cornwall, was constructed at an early date, and provided the basis for important cultural relations between the two counties. The settlement of Lebanon County spread from the areas adjoining Lancaster County, particularly the districts of Lebanon and Mühlbach.

#### D. TOPOGRAPHY OF THE AREAS INVESTIGATED

In Lehigh County the surface is generally rolling, although in some places rugged and somewhat broken. In the southeast are the hills and ridges belonging to the South Mountain range. In the northern part of the county, the Blue (Kittatinny, or North) Mountains run from northeast to southwest, extending into and beyond Berks and Lebanon counties. Between these two mountain ranges there begins a broad valley which is called the Lehigh Valley, and which extends through Berks and Lebanon counties, where it is known as the Lebanon Valley.

Most of the eastern boundary of Lehigh County is formed by the Lehigh River, which rises in Wayne, Pike, and Luzerne counties, cuts through the Blue Mountains (the "Lehigh Water Gap"), and empties into the Delaware River. Saucony Creek rises in Upper Milford Township and, running northeastward, empties into the Lehigh River two miles below Bethlehem. The Little Lehigh rises in Berks County, runs southeastward, receiving the waters of the Cedar and Jordan creeks, and falls into the Lehigh River at Allentown.

The southern part of Berks County is traversed in a southwesterly course by the South Mountain range, here and there broken into irregular spurs. In the northern part there are several elevated ridges. The Kittatinny or Blue Mountain range forms the boundary line between Berks and Schuylkill counties. Between these two mountain ranges lies the great Lebanon Valley.

The principal stream in Berks County is the Schuylkill River, which rises in the carboniferous highlands of Schuylkill County and, flowing in a southeasterly direction, breaks through the Blue Mountains at Port Clinton, flows down by Hamburg, past Reading, and soon thereafter becomes the dividing line between Montgomery and Chester counties. Several of its large tributaries flow through Berks County, the principal one of which is Tulpehocken Creek, which rises in Lebanon County, flows east-southeast and empties into the Schuylkill River near Reading. Maiden Creek, another tributary, rises in

the northeastern part of the county and flows into the Schuylkill River six miles above Reading. Manatawny Creek rises in the southeastern part of the county and flows into the Schuylkill River at Pottstown. There are several smaller streams in the county: Saucony Creek, a branch of Maiden Creek; Northkill Creek, which empties into the Tulpehocken near Bernville; Cacoosing and Spring creeks, which are branches of the Tulpehocken; and Allegheny and Monacasy creeks, emptying into the Schuylkill River below Reading. The Little Swatara rises at the foot of the Blue Mountains and flows in a southwesterly direction into Lebanon County, where it unites with the Great Swatara.

Lebanon County is contiguous to Berks County on the west, and its physical characteristics are similar to those of Berks. The great Lebanon Valley, running between the Blue Mountains on the north and the South Mountains on the south, continues on into and beyond Dauphin County. Lancaster County lies to the south, beyond the South Mountains.

#### E. THE LOCALITIES INVESTIGATED

As a guide to the interpretation of linguistic maps, more specific information is frequently necessary regarding the local areas from which the informants originate. The material was therefore treated in the following manner:

(1) The informants were numbered serially and located according to townships, boroughs, and villages.

(2) The physical geography of each township was outlined: here were included such things as crops and industries.

(3) The settlement history was outlined as completely as possible.

(4) Political history was noted, including such items as the date of formation of counties, townships, and boroughs. Here again data were frequently scant.

(5) Special features of each locality were recorded.

(6) Population statistics for townships and boroughs were listed from the United States Census Reports over intervals of twenty to thirty years.

To list all of this information in detail would lead too far afield at present, but the following distribution of informants, with their serial numbers, should be noted:

<i>Residence</i>	<i>Serial Number</i>
Berks County:	
Lower Heidelberg Township .....	1
North Heidelberg Township .....	2,3
Heidelberg Township .....	4
Womelsdorf .....	5,6,7,8



Marion Township .....	10,12,13,14
Jefferson Township .....	11
Tulpehocken Township .....	15,17,18,19
Bethel Township .....	16
Hamburg .....	21
Center Township .....	22
Richmond Township .....	40
Lebanon County :	
Newmanstown .....	9
Schuylkill County :	
South Manheim Township .....	20
Lehigh County :	
Lynn Township .....	23,24,25,27
Weisenberg Township .....	26,28
Lowhill Township .....	30,31,33,34
South Whitehall Township .....	35
Upper Macungie Township .....	29,32,36,37,38,39
Lower Macungie Township .....	41,42

#### F. VITAE OF THE INFORMANTS

Biographical information on each informant was also recorded, with emphasis on the following items: (1) occupation; (2) age; (3) place of birth and other places of abode; (4) ancestry and places where ancestors of the informant had lived; (5) education; (6) social contacts; (7) personal traits; (8) knowledge of English; (9) knowledge of standard German; (10) knowledge of Pennsylvania German, and more specifically, the informant's ability to read the dialect literature. Careful note was kept of the order in which the field worker finished the record of each informant.

A tabulation of the more useful biographical features thus ascertained may be arranged as follows (with serial numbers of informants as above) :

##### *Occupations of Informants*

Farmers .....	2,4,11,15,16,19,20,22,26,27,28
Farmers with additional occupations .....	1,10,14,18,23,30,31,34,35,40
Veterinarian .....	3
Telegraph operators .....	5,36
Cigar makers .....	6,9
Housewives .....	7,8,13,17,21,33
Teachers .....	12,24,25,32,39,42
Clerk .....	29
Plumber .....	37
Student .....	38
Shoemaker .....	41

*Distribution of Informants According to Age*

18 to 40 years old .....	10,23,29,30,33,37,38
40 to 60 years old .....	4,7,12,17,20,28
60 to 85 years old .....	1,2,3,5,6,8,9,11,13,14,15,16,18,19, 21,22,24,25,26,27,31,32,34,35,36,39,40,41,42

*Education of Informants*

College or Normal School .....	10,12,29,32,36,38,39,40
High School .....	2,7,8,17,20,25,35,42
Grammar School .....	1,3,5,6,9,11,13,14,15,18,21,22,23, 24,26,27,28,30,31,33,34,37,41
Others .....	4,16,19

*Knowledge of Standard German*

Good .....	3,30,39,42
Fair .....	12,13,25,27,32,35,36,41
Slight .....	1,24,28,31,34,40
None .....	2,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,14,15,16,17,18, 19,20,21,22,23,26,29,33,37,38

*Knowledge of the Dialect*

Reading and writing .....	12,39,42
Reading only .....	3,7,13,18,20,24,25,26,28,29,30,32,34,35,40,41
Speaking only .....	1,2,4,5,6,8,9,10,11,14,15,16,17, 19,21,22,23,27,31,33,36,37,38

*Use of English*

Extensive .....	1,3,5,6,8,9,10,12,13,14,17,18, 20,21,22,24,25,29,30,32,34,37,39,40,42
Limited .....	2,7,11,23,27,28,33,35,36,38,41
Very limited .....	4,15,16,19,26,31

*Ancestry of Informants*

About half of the informants interviewed could state the name of the locality in Germany from which their ancestors had come. Eight [3, 5, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 22] traced their forebears to the early Palatine settlers of 1723-29; ancestors of three [20, 21, 39] seem to have come from Württemberg, of one [23] from Switzerland, of another [30] from Alsace, of two more [32, 35] from Mainz; and two [7, 8] claimed to be descendants of the Jewish settlers at Scheafferstown. The reliability of such information is frequently questionable. In the past two hundred years, of course, a complex intermixture of families has taken place, but many people can safely boast of tilling the same soil to which their German ancestors originally laid claim. Family grave plots amply testify to this.

G. CONTENTS OF THE WORK SHEETS<sup>12</sup>

The morphological and syntactical data were secured from the following workbook which is printed entire so that the basis of these studies may be accurately detailed:

1 1. the living room, a small room(s) [*Stübchen*]; 2. the ceiling; 3. the fireplace; 4. the wood is in the fire; 5. the chimney(s), the flue(s); 6. the window(s).

2 1. on the rocking chair(s); 2. the footstool; 3. the chest(s); 4. the kitchen(s); 5. the stove(s), the bake-oven(s); 6. the sink, the faucet(s).

3 1. the pantry(s); 2. the closet for dishes; 3. out in the hall(s); 4. the clothes closet(s); 5. the wardrobe(s); 6. the kitchen is on the ground floor.

4 1. on the second floor; 2. up in the attic; 3. the stairs; 4. he goes upstairs; 5. the bedroom(s); 6. the bed, two beds.

5 1. he's lying in bed, he was lying in bed; 2. the bedsheet(s); 3. the quilt(s); 4. the pillow(s), the pillow slip(s), a featherbed; 5. the straw sack [usually filled with corn husks and used as a mattress]; 6. the cradle(s).

6 1. the linen closet(s); 2. the corner where you hang your clothes [*Kleidercke*]; 3. the dresser(s); 4. the clock has two hands, pendulum; 5. the door(s); 6. the doorknob(s).

7 1. a stone house(s); 2. a brick house(s); 3. a frame house(s); 4. this is our house, this one is ours; your house, yours, their house, theirs; 5. the new house is larger; 6. at the doctor's house.

8 1. a log cabin(s); 2. he is cutting the lawn; 3. where does he live? where did he live? 4. how would it be if we went over to see him? 5. I've been there; 6. you [sg.] have been there.

9 1. the farm(s); 2. our farm is on the creek; your farm, their farm; 3. what do you raise on your farm? on our farm? on their farm? 4. some work in town and some farm; 5. if I were a farmer; 6. he works on the railroad; 7. we go to work.

10 1. the farmhouse(s) [dwelling], [the house where the tenant lives]; 2. the flower garden(s) [bed]; 3. the vegetable garden(s); 4. in this garden, in a small garden; 5. this well is deep, ours is deep; 6. they built that barn [last year], the barns [make a floor plan].

11 1. the barnyard(s); 2. the barn floor; 3. [we walked] to the red barn; 4. the place(s) for hay [the loft]; 5. the place(s) for cattle [describe location, etc.]; 6. the place(s) for horses [describe].

12 1. the place(s) for farm implements [describe location, construction]; 2. the corncrib(s); 3. the granary(s); 4. the pigsty [build-

<sup>12</sup> Numbers in bold face type indicate pagination; these are followed by the numbers of particular items on the page. Directions or suggestions to field workers as well as nonsignificant features of the response are set apart in brackets. Plurals described are indicated by (s). Suggested German forms are given in italics thus: [*standard*], [*dialect*].

ing], [the plot of ground outside the building]; 5. the chicken coop(s) [describe], hen house [size, shape]; 6. the backhouse(s); 7. the fence(s) [picket, rail, barbed wire].

13 1. the frying pan(s); 2. the handle(s); 3. the cooking pot(s) [describe]; 4. the bail(s) [of a pot]; 5. the pan(s) [for baking]; 6. the soup bowl(s), the lettuce bowl(s), the mixing bowl(s).

14 1. that/those cup(s) [is/are cracked]; 2. [these are] good glasses, [use] the good glasses; 3. small glasses, a small glass; 4. she is drying the dishes ["*drickeln*"]; 5. the water bucket(s) [for drinking water, in the house]; 6. he is carrying [a bucket of water].

15 1. the swill bucket(s); 2. he carried away [the swill bucket]; 3. the basket(s) [for the wash, for shopping]; 4. the washboiler(s); 5. [the wash is on the line], it is drying; 6. the barrel(s), a full barrel of molasses.

16 1. the farm wagon(s); 2. he will lend [the wagon] to me, he often lent me [the wagon]; 3. [he said] he didn't need it [right now]; 4. the buggy(s); 5. the whip(s); 6. the swing(s) [for children].

17 1. the seesaw(s); 2. a new broom, new brooms; 3. you ought to sweep [the floor every morning], the floor ought to be swept [every morning]; 4. the whisk-broom(s); 5. the shovel is broken, they broke the shovels; 6. [I can't] find the needle; 7. [I could] not find it anywhere ["*narjets*"].

18 1. I found that [needle]; 2. the knitting needle(s); 3. the pin(s) [*Stecknadel*]; 4. short nails, a short nail; 5. I could use [a short nail]; 6. the match(es); 7. the lantern.

19 1. he is smoking the pipe, [he's smoking] his [and I'm smoking] mine, [he has] two pipes; 2. [this is] strong tobacco, chewing tobacco; 3. the plow(s); 4. he plowed all day, they are plowing sod; 5. he tried to plow [but it was too dry] ["*geproviert*"]; 6. the harrow(s) [different types].

20 1. the drag(s); 2. we sow wheat in the fall; 3. we plant corn in the spring, he is cultivating [the corn]; 4. the mower(s) [machine], I mow the meadow(s), I mowed the meadow(s); 5. [he walked] through the meadow ["*darix*"]; 6. the first crop of hay, the second crop of hay.

21 1. [he said] they need [the hay themselves], [he said] they would need [the hay themselves]; 2. [we cut] the oats; 3. the sheaf(s), the shock(s) [how many bundles?]; 4. the straw stack(s) [in the open, shape?]; 5. a good corn crop; 6. the barley [is cut], the rye [is cut]; 7. [we had] a good harvest.

22 1. [I've had] this dog/these dogs [a long time]; 2. [the dog] barks; 3. [the dog] was let loose ["*gelossa*"]; 4. lie down! [to dog]; 5. he lets [the dog loose]; 6. the cat(s), the tomcat(s); 7. female cat(s), the kittens.

23 1. the cattle, the critters ["*f:æxer*"]; 2. the cow(s), the heifer(s), the calf(s), the bull(s); 3. the ox(en); 4. [calls to go left, calls to go right—when plowing].

24 1. [calls to the cows in the pasture, calls to the cows to make them stand still]; 2. that/those horse(s); 3. the old mare(s); 4. the stallion(s); 5. the gelding(s); 6. a white horse, with that [white horse]; 7. the colt.

25 1. a black horse, horses [of other colors]; 2. [calls to make horses start or go faster, calls to make horses stop]; 3. the little pigs, a little pig; 4. the old sow(s); 5. the boar(s); 6. [calls to pigs].

26 1. a white sheep, white sheep; 2. the little lamb(s); 3. the buck(s); 4. [calls to sheep in the pasture]; 5. [we feed] our chickens [corn], [you feed] your chickens [corn], [they feed] their chickens [corn]; 6. [we give corn to] our chickens, yours, theirs, to your chickens, to their chickens, to ours.

27 1. [we saw a rat among] the young chickens; 2. the hen(s), the hens lay better [in the spring]; 3. the rooster, two roosters; 4. [calls to chickens at feeding time]; 5. goose, geese; 6. long feathers, a white feather.

28 1. the beans, a large bean [pod]; 2. a bunch of beets, a large beet; 3. a head of cabbage, [I don't like] cabbage; 4. a strong garlic; 5. a bunch of onions; 6. a big carrot, the carrots.

29 1. a head of lettuce, [I like] lettuce, it tastes good; 2. large potatoes, a large potato; 3. a row [of potatoes]; 4. red apples, a red apple; 5. [he picked] a red apple; 6. sweet plums, a sweet plum.

30 1. these raisins; 2. ripe strawberries, a ripe strawberry; 3. blueberries; 4. those huckleberries; 5. mulberries.

31 1. before breakfast; 2. what did you eat this morning? what do you two eat for breakfast? 3. for the midday meal? 4. [come over] for the evening meal! 5. a snack [a bite between meals, say at 9:00 A.M., 4:00 P.M.]; 6. the leftovers.

32 1. beef; 2. mutton, I helped myself to [meat]; 3. sausage(s); 4. smoked sausage; 5. liver sausage; 6. blood sausage.

33 1. [other kinds of sausage]; 2. salt and pepper; 3. I break the eggs into [the pan], he broke an egg into [the pan]; 4. liver and lights [liver, lungs, heart, etc.]; 5. the intestines; 6. tripe.

34 1. meatballs, a meatball [describe]; 2. lard; 3. cracklings [Grieben]; 4. scrapple; 5. [butter is made] out of sweet cream, [this is] sweet cream; 6. this butter [is good].

35 1. cottage cheese; 2. [cottage cheese is made] out of sour milk, [this is] sour milk; 3. other kinds of home-made cheese; 4. wheatbread, ryebread; 5. cornbread; 6. she baked bread.

36 1. she is baking cookies; 2. yeast; 3. [this is] the best honey; 4. applebutter; 5. doughnuts, a fresh doughnut [raised or baking-powder]; 6. cakes for special occasions [describe].

37 1. a piece of pie, two pieces of pie; 2. a small piece of [pie], two small pieces; 3. dumpling(s) [describe]; 4. breadcrumbs; 5. oatmeal; 6. do you [sg.] like [oatmeal]?

38 1. mashed potatoes; 2. walnut(s); 3. I am thirsty; 4. a drink of spring water; 5. strong drinks [names]; 6. don't drink too much!

[he always] drinks too much; 7. he got drunk; 8. he is a drunkard.

39 1. this/these apple tree(s) is/are ours; 2. in that orchard; 3. an elm, two elms; 4. this/these oak(s); 5. the acorn(s); 6. the chestnut tree(s).

40 1. the horsechestnut(s); 2. [he climbed up] higher and higher ["*he:xer*"]; 3. the treetop(s); 4. the leaves are falling off; 5. that tree has long branches, cut off this dry branch.

41 1. [what flowers do you grow around here?] [names], roses smell nice; 2. [what are some of the common wild flowers around here?] [describe].

42 1. the squirrel(s); 2. kinds of squirrels [names]; 3. the chipmunk(s); 4. the bird(s) fly away; 5. the little birds, a little bird; 6. the sparrow flew away, the sparrows fly away; 7. the wren.

43 1. an owl, the owls; 2. the cry of the hawk; 3. a nest, the nests; 4. the frog(s); 5. a toad, the toads; 6. mosquitoes, a mosquito.

44 1. the bee(s), the hornet; 2. the bumblebee; 3. the gnat(s); 4. the firefly; 5. a bat, the bats; 6. grasshoppers, a grasshopper; 7. butterfly, moth; 8. the flies [are bad in hot weather].

45 1. a high mountain, the mountains; 2. on the hill, the hills [are blue]; 3. he sees a light from the top of the hill; 4. he sees [a light]; 5. [the road goes] uphill, downhill; 6. don't fall down! [but he] fell down [anyway].

46 1. at the creek(s); 2. the head [of this creek]; 3. [names of creeks and rivers in the neighborhood]; 4. a large lake, in those lakes [are lots of fish]; 5. don't get drowned! 6. [the lake] will soon freeze over, [the lake] is frozen over.

47 1. in the meadow, the meadows [are green]; 2. in the village, several villages; 3. we went to town; 4. [we went to town] to buy oil; 5. [he lives] on that street; 6. on the highway, the highways.

48 1. a country road, the country roads [are bad]; 2. [the road] is dry, is muddy; 3. [the road is covered] with gravel; 4. the railroad [goes by here]; 5. [I went] to the station.

49 1. Pennsylvania; 2. Maryland; 3. New Jersey; 4. Berks County; 5. Lehigh County; 6. Northampton County; 7. Bucks County.

50 1. York County; 2. Lancaster County; 3. Lebanon County; 4. Dauphin County; 5. Snyder County; 6. Schuylkill County; 7. Philadelphia.

51 1. the grocery store(s); 2. [he works] at Schmidt's store; 3. [he works] at Schmidt's; 4. [check the feminine of family names]; 5. the butcher shop(s); 6. at the market; 7. market day.

52 1. [I want] to sell, to buy; 2. [I want] to borrow [some money]; 3. he borrowed [some money from the bank] 4. he borrows, you borrow, I borrow [tools from the neighbors]; 5. [he buys] on credit, [he extends] credit; 6. on the counter; 7. [he has] to make change; 8. one pound of sugar, two pounds of sugar.

53 1. the paper bag(s); 2. a string, the strings; 3. this letter [came today], these letters [came]; 4. in the newspaper.

54 1. the head(s) ; 2. the hair ; 3. the eye(s), the eyelid ; 4. your left eye, in your left eye ; 5. a cheek, on the right cheek ; 6. the mouth, too many mouths.

55 1. this tooth [hurts me], the teeth ; 2. front teeth, eye teeth, molars ; 3. the neck, the throat ; 4. the heart(s) ; 5. the right foot, feet ; 6. my right hand [is sore], my hands.

56 1. a blister on the heel, the heels ; 2. long legs, this leg [is sore] ; 3. a bone, the bones.

57 1. a man's suit(s) ; 2. [patch] the trousers ; 3. the vest ; 4. the coat(s) ; 5. [he had it] in his pocket(s) ; 6. the overcoat(s).

58 1. [where did he] get that shirt ? 2. you get the shirts [in ...] ; 3. a new handkerchief, new handkerchiefs ; 4. the sock [had a hole in it], the socks ; 5. the shoes [are too small] ; 6. a woman's clothes.

59 1. the dress(es) [woman's] ; 2. a long skirt, long skirts ; 3. the blouse, blouses ; 4. a nice brooch ; 5. a bracelet ; 6. a necklace ; 7. wedding, wedding ring(s).

60 1. he goes in rags ; 2. get dressed ! he got dressed ; 3. the clothes brush(es) ; 4. bareheaded ; 5. bald ; 6. barefoot.

61 1. I'm a little bit tired, I'm very tired, I'm all tired out ; 2. do you want [to go to bed] ? 3. he lay down ; 4. he is sleeping ; 5. he has been sleeping ; 6. he snored.

62 1. I wish they'd get up ; 2. [he had] a bad dream ; 3. I have a cold ; 4. otherwise I'm all right ; 5. I had a bad cough ; 6. he coughed hard ; 7. [it got] worse and worse ["*arijer*"] ; 8. [that's] the worst [I've seen him] ["*arigšd*"].

63 1. [he had to] blow his nose ; 2. a toothache ; 3. a stomach-ache ; 4. the measles ; 5. the mumps ; 6. scarlet fever ; 7. diphtheria ; 8. small pox.

64 1. [he had] consumption ; 2. [he died of] pneumonia ; 3. he complained [a long time] ; 4. the coffin, two coffins ; 5. the burial [was yesterday] ; 6. in the cemetery(s), [there are a lot of graves] in that cemetery ; 7. [he is] dead [also veiled terms].

65 1. she's not bad-looking ; 2. she's good-looking ; 3. a good-looking girl ; 4. a beautiful picture, it is beautiful ; 5. she is more beautiful than [her sister], she is the most beautiful [girl in town] ; 6. [he is] handsome ; 7. [she is] showy ; 8. [he is] strong, stronger than I, the strongest man in the county.

66 1. [he's got] more spunk ; 2. they don't say much ; 3. he is old, older than I, the oldest ; 4. [she is] young, younger than I, the youngest ; 5. [I'm] small, smaller than you, the smallest.

67 1. my father [usual and affectionate] ; 2. [I went] with my father, with mine ; 3. my mother [usual and affectionate] ; 4. [I went] with my mother ; 5. our children, child ; 6. [you must be careful] with small children.

68 1. the neighbor's children ; 2. [she played] with the neighbor's children ; 3. every one of [the children is sick], all of these



[children were sick]; 4. one shouldn't spank [children too hard]; 5. the girls, a girl; 6. [do you see] those boys? a boy?

69 1. the babies, a baby; 2. his son(s); 3. her grandson(s); 4. your daughter(s); 5. my older brother [nom. and acc.], with my older brothers; 6. my younger sister(s) [nom. and acc.], with my younger sisters.

70 1. brothers and sisters [collective]; 2. my cousin(s) [male]; 3. my cousin(s) [female]; 4. my husband, their husbands; 5. my wife, their wives; 6. a widow, two widows, a grasswidow; 7. a widower; 8. [is that] a man or a woman?

71 1. his mother-in-law; 2. her father-in-law; 3. your brother(s)-in-law; 4. your sister(s)-in-law; 5. son-in-law; 6. daughter-in-law.

72 1. [he is] courting her; 2. sweetheart(s); 3. she jilted him; 4. they want to get married, they will soon get married; 5. they put it off again; 6. they don't want to put it off [any longer].

73 1. the marriage ceremony; 2. on the wedding day; 3. a wedding celebration; 4. [he didn't know] whether he should go or not; 5. an old country church; 6. the old churches [nom. and acc.]; 7. in this [old church].

74 1. the minister dedicates [the new church]; 2. the dedication day [was well attended]; 3. in the new church; 4. we go [to church on Sunday]; 5. afterwards [we go home]; 6. the pastor preaches a sermon.

75 1. [he] preached a good sermon [*gehalten*]; 2. who teaches in your school? [translation]; 3. give me the book(s)! give me mine! 4. a little book, little books; 5. he brought this [book along]; 6. he brings [it with him].

76 1. he is learning to write, he learned to figure; 2. don't whistle! [teacher to little boy]; 3. look out [for the cars]! [*"geb axd"*]; 4. why don't you obey? 5. now you can go home [teacher to children]; 6. look out [for the cars]! [*"gebt axd"*].

77 1. he came early; 2. both of you were there; 3. they sing a song, songs; 4. I don't know [that song]; 5. the brass band plays a tune, the string band [plays a tune]; 6. a real spree.

78 1. we heard all about it; 2. I'll tell you [all about it]; 3. [I thought] he'd never come home; 4. I wish they'd come home; 5. [he went to town] with my friends, with them; 6. brawls, a brawl.

79 1. our neighbor, your neighbor, their neighbor; 2. [we go] to our nearest neighbor; 3. [I don't] have to tell [you who he is]; 4. we talk about [the weather]; 5. he told us [a funny story]; 6. [he said] do you see [that fellow]? 7. [so I said] I see him.

80 1. don't be offended! 2. I can't believe it; 3. [he can't] deny it; 4. come again soon! 5. he says [he'll come again], he said [that he would come again]; 6. [some other people] were there; 7. come now and then!

81 1. we didn't stay [very long]; 2. he never stays long; 3. [I wish] he would go, they would go; 4. [salutation when meeting a



stranger, salutation when meeting a friend or neighbor]; 5. [salutation when parting from a stranger, salutation when parting from a friend or neighbor].

82 1. he got angry, [she was] awfully angry; 2. grouchy; 3. they razed him [kidded him]; 4. they had a falling out; 5. [she is] stubborn; 6. [I am] satisfied.

83 1. [she is] good-natured; 2. I'm sorry; 3. I'm feeling low; 4. it hurts me; 5. excuse me!

84 1. she called him a fool; 2. a bum; 3. a tightwad; 4. she's a gossip; 5. he's crazy; 6. like hell!

85 1. it's raining; 2. it rained all evening; 3. he's glad of it; 4. [we're having] drizzly weather; 5. [we have] bad weather, in bad weather [the crops don't grow]; 6. he got sore about [the bad weather] [*sich ärgern*]; 7. ice storm [sleet].

86 1. it's snowing; 2. deep snow [is on the ground]; 3. he says [it will rain again soon]; 4. it's hailing; 5. [it's a long time] since [it hailed] [*"sider, sider"*]; 6. [we had] a hailstorm; 7. there were big hailstones; 8. it's sleeting [in winter].

87 1. at Christmas time; 2. Christmas presents [*Christkindel*]; 3. Santa Claus [*Belsnickel*]; 4. a year ago; 5. two years ago; 6. a week ago.

88 1. this week [we've had ... weather]; 2. two weeks ago; 3. a little while ago; 4. a long while ago.

89 1. January, February; 2. March, April; 3. May, June; 4. July, August; 5. September, October; 6. November, December.

90 1. Monday; 2. Tuesday; 3. Wednesday; 4. Thursday; 5. Friday; 6. Saturday; 7. Sunday.

91 1. a weekday, that day [I stayed at home]; 2. today; 3. yesterday; 4. this morning; 5. in the evening, in the morning; 6. it was almost midnight; 7. [they were here] for the week-end.

92 1. one, two; 2. three, four; 3. five, six; 4. seven, eight; 5. nine, ten; 6. it's ten o'clock.

93 1. eleven, twelve; 2. thirteen, fourteen; 3. fifteen, twenty, thirty-one; 4. forty-two, fifty-three, sixty-four; 5. seventy-five, eighty-six, ninety-eight; 6. a hundred, a thousand, ten thousand; 7. he took five; 8. [he's got] enough [*genug, "genunk"*].

94 1. take five! 2. he gave me four, give her four! 3. all sorts of people; 4. he was the fifth, the sixth, the seventh, the fifteenth.

95 1. they came too; 2. [they came] nearer and nearer; 3. somehow [I don't like them] [*"samhau"*]; 4. [he is] behind me; 5. I thought [he was]; 6. I used to know her; 7. [both of you] know her; 8. that time [I was wrong] [*"sel amo:l"*].

96 1. it's no use [*"s bat nix"*]; 2. [go] if you [sg.] want to!; 3. [you two may go, if] you want to; 4. he didn't want [to do it]; 5. I could if I wanted to, they could if they wanted to.

97 1. I should think [you would be glad to] [*dächte*]; 2. [I wish he] would do that [again]; 3. [I don't know] what to do; 4. [I thought] he ought [to do it]; 5. I'd like [to see him]; 6. I don't care to go.

98 1. [I wish] they'd sit down; 2. you two don't have [to do it]; 3. [we do as we] always [used to] [*"alfert"*]; 4. [we didn't know whether he would] ever [get back] [*"sai lewes"*]; 5. [he came closer] in order to [see her better] [*"far zu"*]; 6. be so good [as to tell me a story] [*"biš"*]; 7. [check for relative pronouns].

*University of Washington*  
*University of Wisconsin*

## THE GENESIS OF HAUPTMANN'S IPHIGENIA CYCLE

By WALTER A. REICHART

Throughout his life Hauptmann wrote as he pleased, surprising friends and critics with an abundance in various genres, following his own bent without much consideration for literary fashion or popular demand. In younger years he experimented eagerly and sought new forms and ways to express whatever he felt deeply, but the Greek experience, recounted in detail in *Griechischer Frühling*, affirmed his intuitive kinship with the Hellenic world and opened his eyes to some of the fundamental problems of dramatic conflict. Henceforth, antiquity<sup>1</sup> with all its mythological and philosophical lore became one of the cornerstones of Hauptmann's work, rivaled perhaps only by his lasting interest in Shakespeare. *Griechischer Frühling* represented a new point of departure for the mature artist who had left behind him the naturalistic and romantic drama of his earliest successes and was feeling his way toward a fuller understanding of the chthonic forces of the ancient world. The cool reception of Hauptmann's first Greek drama after his Hellenic experience, *Der Bogen des Odysseus* (begun in Corfu, April 1, 1907), did not shake his faith. In his own "Bemerkungen" to this drama<sup>2</sup> Hauptmann clearly revealed the course he had embarked upon. Elsewhere in his diaries<sup>3</sup> he expressed succinctly the purpose of his dramatic endeavors: "Die kosmische Kraft der alten Tragödie wiedererringen, wäre eine Aufgabe."

Repeatedly an experience, an observation, or even the written word stimulated Hauptmann to a creative activity that finally yielded some of his finest work. At the age of seventy-eight Gerhart Hauptmann began the drama *Iphigenie in Delphi* in precisely this manner. His attention had been directed to Goethe's reference to the Iphigenia theme<sup>4</sup> in the *Italienische Reise*, an account that he had read innumerable times, but which on this occasion kindled his imagination. A propitious mood favored the plan, and in a few months (July 14–September 11, 1940) the drama was written,<sup>5</sup> a drama of the final sacrifice that had been avoided at Aulis through divine intercession, but which becomes voluntary now and fulfills the pronouncement of the oracle. Yet Hauptmann was not satisfied: this drama represented only the last step in the expiation and resolution within a complex cycle of violent crime

<sup>1</sup> The standard work, F. A. Voigt's *Antike und antikes Lebensgefühl im Werke Gerhart Hauptmanns* (Breslau, 1935), is now being revised for early publication.

<sup>2</sup> *Das Gesammelte Werk* (Berlin, 1942), XVII, 314-17.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, XVII, 426.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. my article "Iphigenie in Delphi," *Germanic Review*, XVII (1942), 221-37.

<sup>5</sup> C. F. W. Behl and F. A. Voigt, *Gerhart Hauptmanns Leben: Chronik und Bild* (Berlin, 1942), p. 54.

and bloody revenge among the race of Tantalus. Hence Hauptmann continued, absorbed in the entire series of events that followed upon Helena's fateful flight with Paris, and considered a number of dramas to portray the tragic events from Aulis to Delphi. With the last drama completed first, Hauptmann proceeded at once to an *Iphigenie in Aulis* (begun in September, 1940) in order to give dramatic form to the motivating incident of the entire cycle. Now more than ever contemporary events illuminated the background for his dramatic plans. The Second World War had engulfed Europe with its bloodshed and human hatreds, and presented a suitable parallel to the Trojan War that inflamed the ancient world. Indirectly it was a flight from the grim reality of the day, yet in the realm of antiquity and heroic legend, where Hauptmann sought relief from the intolerable burden of contemporary events, he found the same problems of human guilt and human tragedy in the destructive conflict of the Greeks. Like Goethe, who avoided distressing and disturbing situations in his own environment in order to maintain the atmosphere of serenity so essential to his work, Hauptmann devoted himself to his own work and ignored political developments. After the triumphal tributes to his work on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, Hauptmann's public recognition was officially curtailed<sup>6</sup> after 1933. Until the war he continued to spend his winters in Rapallo and at least part of the summers at Hiddensee, but then he remained more and more in seclusion at his Silesian home in Agnetendorf, where he found the quiet, friendly atmosphere conducive to working. Though troubled by the immediate problems of the day, he fixed his attention upon the tragic figure of Agamemnon and recreated the tragedy of ancient Hellas, but not without an awareness of certain parallels to his own age. Throughout 1941 he labored upon this drama and sought in vain to give it final form and a satisfactory ending. By July, 1942, he put the work aside, still unfinished, though complete in eight versions. The sacrifice of Iphigenia at the altar of Diana and her miraculous disappearance troubled the poet. Unwilling to force an arbitrary ending and do violence to the spirit of the drama,<sup>7</sup> Hauptmann put the work aside and began one of the re-

<sup>6</sup> This attitude became a matter of official record in a formal protest by Alfred Rosenberg to Reichsminister Dr. Goebbels against a whole-hearted recognition of Hauptmann's eightieth birthday. In a letter Rosenberg wrote: "... Ich bitte Sie deshalb, Ihren Beschluß in der Zahl der Aufführungen und Auswahl der Werke doch noch einmal zu überprüfen und rechtzeitig die Presse darauf aufmerksam zu machen, nicht etwa Gerhart Hauptmann als einen Dichter unserer Form zu feiern. Eine merkbare Temperiertheit und eine Anzahl gut gearbeiteter kritischer Artikel erscheinen mir durchaus angebracht, um regulierend zu wirken." "Nazi-Briefwechsel über Gerhart Hauptmann," *Aufbau* (New York), July 12, 1946, p. 7.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. J. Chapiro's *Gespräche mit Hauptmann* (Berlin, 1932), p. 162 f., where this dilemma is discussed: "Der Schlußakt ist fast immer ein Zwang, den der Dramatiker sich oder der Handlung auferlegt. Ja, in den meisten Fällen ist er sogar eine Vergewaltigung der Handlung.... Auf den schöpferischen Drama-

maining middle pieces, *Agamemnons Tod*,<sup>8</sup> which was dictated in its entirety<sup>9</sup> between August 13 and September 11, 1942. In it the inevitable punishment for the attempted crime at Aulis overtakes Agamemnon, not as an atonement or expiation, but because of the bitter vengeance of Clytemnestra, infuriated and debased by the inhuman demands of her husband's ambitions.

In October Hauptmann was ill, and the following month made heavy demands upon him and his time as he visited Hirschberg, Salzbrunn, Breslau, and Vienna in connection with the observance of his eightieth birthday. In 1943 he resumed work on *Der neue Christophorus*, of which the three books completed had just been published by C. F. W. Behl for the "Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen" in Weimar, and set about the completion of the Atrides dramas.

Despite a slight stroke that he suffered on March 28, 1943, and the depressing effect of news of many deaths among old friends, Hauptmann continued to work resolutely. In the early months of the year he revised<sup>10</sup> the *Iphigenie in Aulis* and completed the fifth act ("neunte Fassung") on April 12, so that its publication could coincide with the "Uraufführung" planned by Lothar Mühel for the Vienna Burgtheater on the author's eighty-first birthday.

In the meantime an originally projected "Taurian" Iphigenia had been lost sight of. Whether the prestige of the Goethean tradition weighed too heavily upon him or whether the sacrificial bloodshed and slaughter of the original Greek legend deterred him from proceeding

tiker hat jede Familienszene, jede Auseinandersetzung mit einem ihm nahestehenden Menschen, ja alles eine segensreiche Wirkung, weil der Künstler jedes Geschick und jedes Schicksal in mehreren Formen und Bildern vor sich sieht. Deshalb hat auch jedes meiner Stücke, bevor ich es aus der Hand gebe, so viele Fassungen. . . ."

<sup>8</sup> *Agamemnons Tod* and *Elektra* were performed at the *Kammerspiele* of the *Deutsches Theater* in Berlin in September, 1947. These two one-act dramas have been published in one volume (Berlin: P. Suhrkamp Verlag, 1948) to complete the tetralogy.

<sup>9</sup> Reported by C. F. W. Behl in "Arbeit und Leben mit Gerhart Hauptmann," *Berliner Hefte*, II (1947), No. 1, p. 10.

<sup>10</sup> Joseph Gregor in his "Gerhart Hauptmanns Atriden-Tetralogie und ihre Vorläufer" (*Phaidros: Zeitschrift für die Freunde des Buches und der schönen Künste*, II. Jahrgang, Folge 1 [Wien: H. Bauer Verlag, 1948], p. 72) sheds new light upon the composition of the final act:

"Aber noch als ich im Frühjahr 1942 bei Gerhart Hauptmann erschien . . . fand ich ihn in schweren Bedenken über die Gestaltung des Schlusses. Ich machte ihn darauf aufmerksam, daß die eigentlich anziehendste Figur des Stückes gar nicht Iphigenie sei, deren glänzende Entwicklung er ja schon vorweggenommen hatte, sondern Agamemnon. Ich empfahl, diesen als von dem Opferspruch und seiner Aufgabe Besessenen zu schildern, der achlos über das Opfer des eigenen Kindes hinweggeht: nur so erhielten wir das vollgültige Zeugnis unserer Zeit. Keineswegs durch den euripideischen Agamemnon, der im Falle eines Rückzuges nach Griechenland die Blamage und eine Revolution befürchtet. Hauptmann begrüßte diesen Gedanken überaus und so sehen wir den Helden tatsächlich vor uns, wie ein Schlächter überströmt von Blut, das er für das der Tochter halten muß und mit dem besinnungslosem Schrei 'Auf nach Ilion!'—ein taubes Werkzeug in der Hand der Götter."

with this material, Hauptmann never seriously considered this phase of the legend, but turned to another facet of the Iphigenia story in order to complete his tetralogy. Between October 6 and November 11, 1944, Hauptmann wrote *Elektra*,<sup>11</sup> the second one-act drama, to round out the Iphigenia cycle, while he continued dictating on *Der neue Christophorus*, completed *Mignon*, and wrote verses in the manner of the *Diwan*. Though these one-act dramas perhaps do not equal in vigor and poetic quality the two full-length tragedies, this monumental series of Greek dramas, modern and yet in the spirit of antiquity, represent a final *tour de force* in Hauptmann's career as a great dramatist.

The process of dramatic composition in Hauptmann's later years bears little resemblance to the notebook method and detailed study of sources in his early writings. Investigations<sup>12</sup> have revealed minute historical and linguistic research in preparation for the dramas *Florian Geyer* or *Der arme Heinrich*, but there is nothing like that in the composition of the Iphigenia cycle. Once the theme of the ill-fated descendants of Tantalus had captured Hauptmann's imagination, he projected a series of dramas, which, while relating the legendary stories of ancient Greece, reflected human values and human conflicts in their eternal significance and basic timeliness. Hence he was less interested in examining sources or critical studies, and confined himself to a few popular accounts of Greek mythology and the ancient dramatists who first gave these tragedies to world literature. His customary impatience with erudite critical research made him avoid scholarly treatises of classical philologists like Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's introductions and translations<sup>13</sup> of the Greek tragedies, and turn primarily to a few old favorites that had become his intimate companions many years before. First and foremost Hauptmann depended upon the popular translations of Aeschylus and Euripides by J. J. C. Donner<sup>14</sup> which he had prized highly since his youth. Gustav Schwab's *Die schönsten Sagen des klassischen Altertums* (1837) and a copy of Friedrich Lübker's often revised *Reallexikon des Altertums*

<sup>11</sup> Published in the summer issue of *Die neue Rundschau*, 7. Heft (1947), pp. 301-30.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. H. J. Weigand's "Auf den Spuren von Hauptmanns *Florian Geyer*," *PMLA*, LVII (1942), 1160-95, and LVIII (1943), 797-848; F. A. Voigt's "Die Entstehung von Gerhart Hauptmanns *Florian Geyer*," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, LXIX (1947), 149-213, and Reichart-Diamond's "Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Armen Heinrich," *G. H. Jahrbuch*, I (1937), 59-87.

<sup>13</sup> A reference to Hauptmann's critical attitude toward this great scholar is recorded by Voigt in the "Chronik" of *Gerhart Hauptmann: Studien zum Werk und zur Persönlichkeit* (Breslau, 1942), p. 224.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Abenteuer meiner Jugend* (*D. G. Werk*, XIV, 649): "Noch heute ist das gleiche Exemplar des von Donner übersetzten Aischylos in meiner Hand, aus dem ich damals den 'Gefesselten Prometheus' studierte." Already, when Hauptmann discussed the Orestes-Hamlet parallel of blood guilt and vengeance (*Im Wirbel der Berufung* [*D. G. Werk*, XIII, 558 ff.]), he cited Donner's translation of the *Choephoroi* (*Das Totenopfer* [1854], pp. 94, 106, 119, 128).

(1854) were constantly used for reference, and represent the typical aids<sup>15</sup> that Hauptmann considered indispensable.

The opening speech of *Iphigenie in Aulis* reveals in masterly fashion the bewilderment and despair of the Greek soldiers who only a little earlier had hailed the campaign against Troy with jubilant acclaim.

O Gott, in welchem Graun sind wir gefangen!  
Was ist geschehn, daß tausend Schiffe nun  
zerbröckeln in der Bucht von Aulis? Wütig  
sind sie erst jüngst herangebraust zum Kampf.  
Nun ja: es brennt der Himmel gnadenlos.<sup>16</sup>  
Nach Wasser heulend, schreiend, kreischend zieht,  
von Priestern angeführt, das Volk umher  
in Prozession, soweit nicht Raserei  
des blinden Wahnsinns es zur Erde schleudert,  
wo es mit blutigen Händen hoffnungslos  
nach Wasser gräbt. Mit Jauchzen hub es an!

Dissension in the ranks, bitter enmity between Ulysses and Agamemnon, and the threatening hostility of Apollo's sister make Calchas, the priest, the key figure in the developing crisis. Mob psychology demands an act of penance, and in its naïve primitivism, "nach altverruchtem, heut verfluchtem Brauch," demands the blood sacrifice of their leader's daughter. Agamemnon has yielded to the importunities of the people voiced by the priest, and has sent for his wife and daughter. But the struggle within him has just begun: a struggle that destroys him. Basically this drama is the tragic conflict within Agamemnon, who sets into motion events that are soon beyond his control and threaten his life, his family, and his nation. Only because the legendary material made the sacrifice of Iphigenia in the temple of Aulis the focal point of the dramatic action has the usual title been preserved. Nevertheless Hauptmann's drama is centered around Agamemnon, while Iphigenia, a mere shadow, recedes into the background as a motivating symbol. Even Clytemnestra becomes only a foil in the terrible contest between Agamemnon and Calchas that reveals the essence of all tragedy.<sup>17</sup> Calchas, the seer and priest, has by virtue of his office elevated himself to a position in which his power and influence exceed those of Agamemnon. For he alone has the backing of the gods and in interpreting their wishes his judgments have a finality that is accepted by the people.

Des Bunds geheimste Weihen schützen und  
erleuchten ihn, und eifersüchtig wacht

<sup>15</sup> I am grateful to Dr. F. A. Voigt for such information about sources used.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Hauptmann's comment to Behl: "Einige antike Schriftsteller nennen als Grund des Festliegens der Griechenflotte in der aulischen Bucht den Sturm, andere die Windstille. Ich finde die Windstille viel unheimlicher. Es gibt nichts Lasternderes, Bedrückenderes als einen ewig blauen Himmel." "Zwiesprache mit Gerhart Hauptmann," *Prisma* (1947), Heft 8, p. 28, entry of June 20, 1943.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Hauptmann's earlier statement in *Griechischer Frühling* (*D. G. Werk*, V, 182): "... das Menschenopfer, das die blutige Wurzel der Tragödie ist."



er überm Tempeldienst und seinen Rechten.  
 Es wühlt in ihm versteckt ein tiefer Groll,  
 weil Agamemnon, Herrin, dein Gemahl,  
 die Priester seiner Art der Herrschaft zeigt  
 sowie der Goldgier und sie Wühler nennt,  
 die um gemeinen Vorteils willen mit  
 den Göttern Mißbrauch treiben und der Völker  
 einfältige Gläubigkeit ruchlos mißbrauchen.

In these lines Hauptmann states clearly the basic premise of the tragic conflicts which will not only destroy the happiness of Agamemnon and his family, but will also engulf the Hellenic world in a gigantic blood bath. Agamemnon is still wavering, bewildered by the awful fate proclaimed for Iphigenia, vacillating between his own feelings as a human being and father and the inexorable demands placed upon him as commander-in-chief of the Greek forces. The power of traditional beliefs, hallowed customs, and religious rites endangers mankind. Agamemnon acknowledges his helplessness as "ohnmächtiges Spielzeug grauvoller Götter und Menschen" in the face of the overwhelming force of traditional religious practices. The cruel and barbaric blood sacrifice of more primitive times has impressed the credulous masses, the oracular wisdom of Calchas brooks no contradiction, and finally Agamemnon becomes convinced of the gods-inspired purpose of his mission. There is no doubt or hesitation, only absolute certainty and fanatical zeal in his determination to carry out the bloody sacrifice. He mocks all opposition, and whereas he was at first dubious and uncertain, he finally defies all counsel and advice and insists, "was ich erfuhr, ist heilige Offenbarung."<sup>18</sup> In despair and resignation Agamemnon seeks to convince Clytemnestra of the futility of her protests. She, who had fled with Iphigenia from Aulis when she learned of the ruse that had brought them there, reveals her passionate love for her favorite child as she rages defiance to gods and men. But Agamemnon, pitying the hybris of her defiance, acknowledges the all-consuming devastation of war. Nowhere has Hauptmann expressed so simply and yet so poignantly the spectacle of the juggernaut of war crushing all life and hope before its advance. The memories of World War I—in which his four sons were under arms, his favorite nephew fell, and his first wife died of a heart attack while anxiously awaiting news from the front—and Hauptmann's full realization of the cruelty of war, even

<sup>18</sup> Hauptmann in his "Aufzeichnungen" repeatedly has emphasized this thought: "Irrtümer, durch Überzeugung und Mehrheit getragen, werden nur stärker in ihrer Wesenheit als Irrtümer, entfernen sich damit aber nur um so weiter von der Wahrheit" (*D. G. Werk*, XVII, 381). "Die absoluten Wahrheiten—scheint mir—haben das größte Unheil angerichtet. Daher ist weniger verborgen durch Wissen als durch Glauben, durch Denken als durch Eingebung. Die 'Nägel' im Menschenhirn, das ist die Gefahr: um sie herum beginnt es immer zu eitem" (*ibid.*, XVII, 383). The essay "Duldsamkeit" (*ibid.*, XVII, 310-13) expresses most completely Hauptmann's condemnation of fanaticism and tyranny in art, religion, and life.

as World War II was already raging throughout Europe, find adequate expression in these blunt words:

Armselige! Die Kriegeswagen donnern,  
die Speere sausen, und die Schwerter blitzen,  
der Pferde Hufe schmettern in das Erdreich,  
alles zerstampend! Stelle dich nur hin  
und hebe deine Weiberarme auf,  
entpresse Schreie deiner Weibergurgel  
und arme Worte, die kein Mensch versteht:  
"Kehrt um, ihr Rasenden! hört mein Gebot  
als Mutter, schonet, schonet meiner Kinder,  
schont meiner, schonet meine arme Tochter!"  
Die Götter hör' ich ihr olympisch Lachen  
anstimmen, Törlin!

The parallels of the gigantic conflict of Greek legend with the upheaval of the Second World War are too obvious to require emphasis. A conscious and deliberate juxtaposition of these conflagrations was certainly not Hauptmann's intent or desire, as he always resented any suggestion that his work needed a key to unlock any hidden symbolism. However, it had never been possible for him to write in a vacuum, remote from the actualities of life as he lived or observed them. His entire work is intimately linked to the experiences that gave him stimuli to creative writing. The Iphigenia cycle is unthinkable without contemporary events. Chance first attracted Hauptmann to the Iphigenia theme, yet the determined effort throughout four years of bloodshed to complete and to exhaust this ancient theme in terms not of war and conflict, but of the brutalizing effects of war upon the most sacred of human relationships, has its own justification. The mighty Agamemnon, revered and respected throughout the Attic world, is stripped of all human attributes as the madness of man unleashes his basest impulses. All human emotions, every semblance of devotion and love to wife and daughter, to family, tribe, and nation are stifled in the mad frenzy of conflict. Political expediency, lust for power, an insensate acceptance of the sweeping plague that quickly engulfs a warring nation are only varying expressions of that human baseness aroused so easily and fanned into consuming flames. Suddenly the world has changed and with it its people. Hauptmann went back to ancient Greece and its well-known stories of the accursed house of Tantalus, but in a realistic, almost naturalistic depiction of the horrors of war and its disastrous consequences for mankind he found a poetic language unexcelled in his later works. The following description of the sudden and inexplicable changes that have come over the Greek forces and their leaders epitomizes the universal tragedy of war:

Die Erde hat gebebt. Der Menschen Städte  
erzittern, fürchten ihren Untergang.  
Was für die Ewigkeit gemauert schien,  
zerbröckelt knisternd, knirscht und wankt im Grund.

Die Sterne werfen sich aus ihren Bahnen,  
 Die Erde fiebert und der Mensch mit ihr.  
 Die Götter kommen wiederum zu Ansehn,  
 die man im Wohlergehen fast vergaß:  
 sie zeigen drohend sich allüberall  
 dem Menschevolk, das nun voll jähren Schrecks  
 allüberall auf seine Götter stößt.  
 Es geht nicht mehr um Wohlsein, Königin,  
 ein Weniger, ein Mehr davon, o nein:  
 es geht um alles!—Sitte, schöner Schein,  
 der hohe Adel köstlicher Gewöhnung  
 ward losgebundener Dämonen Raub.  
 Vertrocknet und zersprungen glüht die Erde.  
 Der Würger Hunger mordet Mensch und Tier,  
 die Pest, wie eine Wölfin, neben ihm.  
 Es wird der Mensch sogar des Menschen Wolf  
 und stillt mit seinesgleichen seinen Hunger.  
 Vertrocknet sind die Quellen: statt des Wassers  
 hütet der Stromgott brennendes Gestein.  
 Was ist der Aufruhr anders denn im Heer  
 als todesangstgenährte Raserei?  
 Damit man gierig Speise wiederum  
 einschlingen könne, eifert jeder Mann,  
 den Göttern—die man für gefräßig hält  
 und dankbar—in Verzweiflung Weib und Kind  
 auf blutigen Altären hinzuschlachten.

Here is the clearest proof of the impact that the war had made upon Hauptmann's consciousness. In keeping with his usual method and workmanship Hauptmann accepted the terrible tragedy of war with a stoicism that did not permit of idle, unavailing protests. His only recourse was to translate and transmute the sordid events of the contemporary scene into dramatic pictures in the Hellenic world. Therefore it was less of a flight from reality than an attempt to make life tolerable by giving dramatic form to experiences that might otherwise have overwhelmed and paralyzed his poetic gifts. Hauptmann depicted the horrors of barbaric tyranny and inhuman fanaticism in another age, but in doing so he portrayed startlingly the tragedy of Germany. In the last years of his life he could still collect his strength, and despite the general artistic poverty of the Hitler era he produced a series of dramas worthy to rank with the best that his age had produced. But he needed the familiar environment and his beloved Silesian soil, even as he wrote of ancient Greece. Great art is timeless, and trafficking in contemporary problems and actualities rarely achieves permanent values because of a lack of perspective. Now and then, however, a poet finds problems that are timeless, that repeat with uncanny regularity a basic pattern, and reflect human passions and ambitions that have not lost their truth over the years. The gloom and pessimism of Hauptmann during the First World War found its fullest expression in the atmosphere of *Winterballade*, written between 1914 and 1916 and

published the following year ("Uraufführung," October 17, 1917). Hauptmann's despair and revulsion in the early days of the Nazi regime were climaxed in the tortured outburst, "ich will kein Mensch sein," in *Das Meerwunder* (*D. G. Werk*, XIII, 145), and the Iphigenia tetralogy passes judgment in the fullest sense upon the political madness of our day. Only two quotations that might be as applicable to Hitler's Germany as to the Greece of Agamemnon's day need be cited:

... der Wahnsinn herrscht!

Ganz Hellas ist sein fürchterlicher Herd;  
auf ihm verbrennt zu Asche, was den Griechen  
dem Unflat der Barbarenwelt enthob,  
und köpflings stürzt er sich in ihren Blutsumpf:

Im Land der Schatten ist die Seligkeit.  
Einst war ein Reich, man hieß es Griechenland!  
Es ist nicht mehr! Denn wo noch wären Griechen?  
Ich sehe keinen um mich weit und breit.

In closing the drama with the traditional sacrifice of Iphigenia at the altar of Diana in Aulis, Hauptmann followed the legendary material, but motivated the final appearance of a tortured, bloodstained Agamemnon, who returns home after the fall of Troy, a ragged beggar, not a triumphant victor. Such a presentation in *Agamemnons Tod*, which parallels the fate attributed to the returning Ulysses, does violence to the traditional story and at first glance may seem puzzling. However, Hauptmann saw with inexorable logic the necessity for such treatment. The modern poet, no longer enthralled by heroic conquests and toppling towers, sees Agamemnon only as the first and most pitiful victim of war. In contrast to the heroic figure that went forth to battle, leading a victorious army, he returns shipwrecked, weary, stripped of everything but life, his senses dulled, and yet vaguely aware of his approaching death. The tragic irony of this change wrought by the murderous war of which poets have sung gloriously since the time of Homer is in keeping with Hauptmann's deep love for humanity and his horror of war.<sup>19</sup> But life holds nothing more for Agamemnon as he stumbles to his doom. In an old temple of Demeter on the outskirts of Mycena,

<sup>19</sup> Since earliest youth, Hauptmann, who was pacifistically inclined, had protested against war and the mass murder of war. The following are typical utterances from his work and his diaries:

"Es ist verkehrt, den Mord im Frieden zu bestrafen und den Mord im Krieg zu belohnen. Verkehrt ist es dann, die Religion Christi, diese Religion der Duldung, Vergebung und Liebe, als Staatsreligion zu haben und dabei ganze Völker zu vollendeten Menschenschlächtern heranzubilden." (Loth in *Vor Sonnenaufgang* [*D. G. Werk*, I, 307].)

"Voraussetzung der Kultur ist, daß dem Menschenleben höchste Wichtigkeit beigemessen wird. Krieg, dem das Menschenleben nichts gilt, verleugnet, ja verrät deshalb die Kultur." (*Ausblicke*, p. 77.)

"Wo kann man die Menschen hinführen? Ich fürchte immer nur wieder in den Kampf." (*D. G. Werk*, XVII, 392.)

"Will Gott den Frieden nicht—ich will ihn!" (*D. G. Werk*, XVII, 397.)

Clytemnestra kills Agamemnon while the cowardly Aegisthus slays Cassandra. This one-act drama and the final one, *Elektra*, which takes place in the ruins of this temple, complete the dramatic cycle, and prepare for the final expiation in the full-length drama, *Iphigenie in Delphi*.

What has Hauptmann made of the hallowed legendary material that had challenged the ancient dramatists and had continued to appeal to modern poets in French and German classical eras? He has omitted everything that has no direct bearing upon the tragic conflicts engendered by the blood guilt of Agamemnon who yielded to the council of Calchas and participated in the blood sacrifice in Aulis. To be sure, Agamemnon, bereft of reason, did not see that a hind had replaced Iphigenia on the altar, and he carried out what he considered to be his duty. His war-crazed mind dulled his perception, and in his madness he proceeded to Troy believing that he had slain his daughter. For Hauptmann this blood guilt and the hatred which it aroused in Clytemnestra are the roots of the conflict that raged unabated until Iphigenia's voluntary sacrifice atones for the long series of crimes. Hauptmann wishes to exemplify the concepts of dramatic art, as he had begun to understand them almost four decades earlier, when he contemplated the chasms of the Phaedriades at Delphi and remembered that murder was an integral part of Greek tragedy and perpetuated guilt in an endless chain.<sup>20</sup> Hauptmann avoided the story of Iphigenia among the Taurians, and thus rid himself of the pseudoclassical French treatment with the emphasis upon the romance of Thoas and his unrequited love. Even Goethe's philosophy of "Humanität" and his psychological analysis of Orestes' purification is in the spirit of eighteenth-century European thought. Thoas, who reveals in his renunciation the lofty idealism and self-restraint cherished by the classical Goethe, is not Greek. He is a figment of eighteenth-century romantic imagination.

Hauptmann makes Agamemnon the heroic figure of the ancient world, the leader and the greatest of his nation, jubilantly acclaimed by his people until ambition and war psychosis brutalize him so that he forgets wife, daughter, and soldiers in the mad delusion of political power and willingly slaughters whoever stands in his way. And Iphigenia never becomes the central character in any of the dramas. Even in the final play, *Iphigenie in Delphi*, Electra is the dominant

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *D. G. Werk*, V, 183 f.: "... keine wahre Tragödie ohne den Mord, der zugleich wieder jene Schuld des Lebens ist, ohne die sich das Leben nicht fortsetzt, ja, der zugleich immer Schuld und Sühne ist. . . . Es kann nicht geleugnet werden, Tragödie heißt: Feindschaft, Verfolgung, Haß und Liebe als Lebenswut! Tragödie heißt: Angst, Not, Gefahr, Pein, Qual, Marter, heißt Tücke, Verbrechen, Niedertracht, heißt Mord, Blutgier, Blutschande, Schlächtereier—wobei die Blutschande nur gewaltsam in das Bereich des Grauens gesteigert ist."

figure of the drama, whereas Iphigenia—consecrated as a priestess and more remote from the worldly conflicts of human emotions—quite properly becomes almost the *dea ex machina* of Greek tragedy. She is no longer the naïve Iphigenia who came to Aulis eagerly in anticipation of her betrothal to Agamemnon. The intervening experience as priestess has consecrated her to the service of the gods. Human happiness is no longer for her. She was removed from the ranks of mankind when she became an instrument of the gods. As a priestess she has sacrificed human lives at the altar and cannot return to the happiness of human life. She herself realizes her plight and is ready and willing to take upon herself the task of voluntary sacrifice in order to redeem her family. The prayer that had been constantly on her lips during her exile in Tauris has been heard, and on her return to Delphi she finds the strength to remain true to herself and, like Prospero in *Indipohdi*, leaves the world to grant life to others:

Genug: ich starb ins Göttliche hinein  
und mag im Sterblichen nicht wieder leben.

*University of Michigan*





Lettres soit un grand homme. De même qu'il n'y en a pas pour que le Parlement des Lettres soit composé des quarante meilleurs écrivains. Le Français moyen est volontiers appelé à ces fonctions, à condition d'avoir le génie du Français moyen, d'exceller par certaines qualités de prudence ou de sagesse, de servir de miroir et de régulateur à un grand nombre d'esprits, de régner sur l'usage et de dire le goût. Régner sur l'usage par le dictionnaire et la grammaire, dire le goût par des *Observations sur le Cid*, c'était la fonction que Richelieu avait attribuée au Parlement académique. Le Parlement académique n'y réussit pas, s'y discrédita. Dans la République des Lettres la deuxième moitié du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle fait souffler un vent antiparlementaire. L'expérience découvre lentement que régner sur l'usage et dire le goût est plutôt l'affaire d'un Président. La question de la Présidence de la République des Lettres, présidence constitutionnelle et tempérée, est posée. . . .

Chapelain a quarante ans de plus que Boileau. Il était inévitable que l'autorité de Chapelain fût déclassée par la génération de Boileau. Mais il n'était pas inévitable qu'il fût remplacé par Boileau, qu'une autorité, une Présidence, succédassent dans la République des Lettres à une autorité et à une Présidence. C'était d'autant moins inévitable que Boileau n'y prétendait pas et n'y prétendit en somme jamais. Si un écrivain a jamais eu la vocation d'un indépendant et pas du tout celle d'un régent, c'est Boileau. Jamais il n'a pensé qu'il pût tenir une fonction de direction et de contrôle, à la manière de Chapelain, entrer dans l'administration et dans le gouvernement. Pour qu'il y soit entré malgré lui, et après sa mort bien plutôt que de son vivant, il a fallu qu'il fût pris dans un mouvement qui le dépassait, dans un génie qui n'était pas le sien, mais bien celui des lettres françaises elle-mêmes. Personne n'a moins songé à légiférer que le législateur du Parnasse, à régenter que le régent des lettres. Ce qu'on appelle l'esthétique de Boileau, les principes de Boileau, les Codes de Boileau, cela a été construit après lui et d'après lui. Le militant des lettres a été fait Président des lettres d'une manière bien singulière, qui ne consiste pas dans une carrière, comme celle de Chapelain, mais dans une histoire et une aventure. On n'imagine pas Chapelain en dehors de l'Académie, autrement que comme organe de l'Académie, modérateur de l'Académie au sens où l'on était à Genève modérateur de la Compagnie des pasteurs, superacadémicien comme on dirait aujourd'hui. Au contraire, Boileau ne devait pas être de l'Académie. L'Académie repoussait Boileau. Il fallut que Louis XIV le lui imposât. Et c'est peut-être dommage. Bien des impondérables eussent été changés dans l'atmosphère de la République des Lettres si l'auteur des *Satires* avait occupé le fauteuil de l'auteur des *Provinciales*, le quarante et unième. Il eût paru à tous les yeux que Boileau est le contraire du sujet académique, alors que le préjugé a tendance à voir en lui la perfection du sujet académique. Victor Hugo ne s'y trompait pas, qui voyait en Racine le vrai classique, en Boileau l'artiste pittoresque et libre. N'exagérons pas. Mais enfin avec Boileau (Boileau et ses amis, je veux bien, tout de même Boileau surtout) entrent dans la littérature trois genres de vie qui restent des levains de la littérature : ceux de l'homme dans la rue, du jeune, du militant. . . .

La marque des quatre amis de 1661, de la grande équipe classique, c'est qu'il sort de chacun d'eux des radiations indéfinies, inépuisables, inattendues, qui ne sortent au même degré d'aucun poète des époques, ni de Ronsard, ni de Corneille, ni des romantiques, une source de références et d'allusions, une familiarité particulière. Molière par le théâtre et La Fontaine par l'école sont ainsi entrés dans la vie moyenne des Français. Racine circule pareillement dans la mémoire créatrice du Français lettré, y prend presque à chaque génération depuis Voltaire un visage nouveau. *Présence de Racine*, c'est une marque du climat littéraire français. Et Boileau?

Pendant près de deux siècles, *Présence de Boileau* a été une marque du même climat. Mais c'était le Boileau de l'*Art Poétique*. C'était le Boileau regardé,

discuté ou moqué comme législateur du Parnasse, ce qu'il ne voulut jamais être et ne fut jamais. Les remarques d'histoire hasardeuse et de bon sens qu'il a mis dans les quatre chants de son poème didactique, la trentaine de vers proverbes qui en sont émanés, n'ont pas plus influé sur le théâtre ou le lyrisme que les *Géorgiques* n'ont enseigné la taille de la vigne ou l'élevage des veaux aux vétérans d'Auguste. *L'Art Poétique* s'est imposé comme les *Géorgiques* par sa forme, et en tirer une matière doctrinale, une esthétique, une philosophie de la littérature, c'est un exercice scolaire qu'on traitera encore fort honorablement en remarquant qu'il est aujourd'hui dépassé.

Mieux que *l'Art Poétique*, le *Lutrin* constituerait à Boileau "présence." Flaubert rêvait d'écrire, à propos de *Madame Bovary*, quelque chose qui se tint tout seul, sans sujet, sans matière, et rien que par la force du style. Or Boileau a voulu faire et a réussi dans le *Lutrin* quelque chose d'analogue. Ce qui nous plaît d'ailleurs dans la remarque célèbre de Flaubert, c'est le caractère bienfaisant de l'illusion qu'elle implique. Car le style seul cela n'existe pas, et *Madame Bovary* au contraire, précisément par sa restriction, par son refus de surfaire, par cette décision de tourner le dos à la *Tentation de Saint Antoine*, décision qui rappelle (*mutatis mutandis*) Boileau tournant le dos à la *Pucelle*, nous est arrivée chargée de choses, de personnages types, de proverbes, de matière psychologique, sociale, littéraire, de réformes en un mot. L'élément parodique du roman n'y est sans doute pas étranger. Quoi qu'il en soit, on trouve dans le *Lutrin* une association analogue de la tenue par le style et de la tenue par les références.

La solidité, le corps et la sève de ces alexandrins ne peuvent se comparer qu'à des tirades de Racine, et représentent le secret même de la génération de 1661 (le style en vers de Molière et de La Fontaine, qui appartenaient à la demi-génération antérieure, c'est autre chose), un secret qui disparaîtra avec elle comme a disparu le secret du vers virgilien. Cela a de quoi se tenir, comme la première Bucolique, et *Madame Bovary*, par la force du style. Mais les références?

D'abord, il y a un cadre, comme la Normandie de *Madame Bovary* ou le Paris de Balzac et des *Misérables*: le Palais et la Sainte-Chapelle. . . .

Enfin le *Lutrin* c'est en France la tête—j'allais dire la crème de tête—de toute la littérature seconde. J'entends par littérature seconde la littérature qui pousse sur la littérature, comme la littérature première serait la littérature qui pousse sur la vie. La littérature-gui, que des lettrés, comme les druides, coupent avec une faucille d'or. D'un côté, le *Lutrin* ouvre la voie où s'avancent le *Télémaque*, les *Martyrs*, les Parnassiens, Anatole France surtout, de *Sylvestre Bonnard* à la *Révolte des Anges*. Et bien des lecteurs me diront qu'au lieu de l'ouvrir il aurait bien dû la fermer. Et c'est un point de vue. Mais d'un autre côté le *Lutrin*, poème parodique, est un poème critique, le poème d'un critique. On ne peut pas tuer la critique, surtout sous ces formes aimables. Et surtout l'on ne peut pas demander à un critique de tendre le couteau pour la tuer.

On voit dès lors se confirmer les raisons de maintenir Boileau comme président de la République pérenne des lettres. Tout le XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle a voté pour lui. L'opposition de 1830 n'a été qu'un feu de paille. Bientôt Musset lui apportait son bulletin. Sainte-Beuve, qui lui avait fait une opposition de couloirs à la Briand, prononce en sa faveur les grands discours décisifs en prose de *Port-Royal* et des *Lundis*, et même des discours en vers, avec la *Fontaine de Boileau*. Hugo envoie de Guernesey un bulletin de vote inattendu. Flaubert vote pour Boileau avec l'ironie que Clemenceau a pu mettre à voter pour Loubet, mais enfin il vote.

Avant la guerre, la *Revue Critique des Idées et des Livres* ouvrait sur Boileau un plébiscite où se rencontraient les bulletins de Barrès et de Claudel. Nous n'avons ni envie ni motifs de modifier cet état de choses. Le président reste le Président.

At the very beginning, Thibaudet offers us a diptych: the Frenchman *vs.* the Englishman. He purports to reproduce a judgment on the Frenchman formed by foreigners (mainly the English), consisting of a list of apparently disparate and peculiar traits—which he immediately matches with a similar caricatural outline of the Englishman, in which each trait singled out has its pendant in the previous description. Thibaudet's shift from foreigners in general to the English in particular is probably due, first, to the innate French tendency to think in terms of evenly balanced bi-polarities; and his choice of the English (instead, for example, of the Germans, who have surely been equally vocal in their condemnation of the "Boileau-tropia" by which the French are affected) may have been dictated by his desire to oppose two preponderantly conservative peoples. As concerns the diptych form adopted by Thibaudet, this, as we have said, is typically French: one thinks immediately of Victor Hugo, who believed it possible to exhaust reality by recourse to the contrast of polarities. But the well-known Romantic antithesis is, itself, a derivation of the classical ideal of the golden mean, the "juste milieu," equidistant from the two extremes. And Thibaudet, with his Frenchman's eye for duality, has been the one to point out for us, repeatedly, the duality existing in French civilization: in poetry he finds such couples as Corneille and Racine, Pascal and Descartes, Voltaire and Rousseau, etc. (cf. his *Géographie littéraire de la France*) as opposed to the single figure of Shakespeare in England, the single figure of Goethe in Germany; in political life he has discerned the basic couple of the "boursier" and the "héritier," with their variations in the professors and the attorneys, in "Herriot-Poincaré," in the "instituteurs" and the "curés," and any attempt to reduce the polarities in question would have seemed to Thibaudet absurd. Thus, along with his tendency toward ramification and multiplicity of parallels, which we have pointed out earlier, we may also find the voluntary restriction implied by the dualistic pattern.

In the diptych of the Frenchman *vs.* the Englishman, the obvious point to be made concerns the disparity between the traits singled out in both cases. Here we have basically the same tendency which we found earlier (for example, in Thibaudet's association of carved-wood furniture and international-mindedness as characteristic of Austria), only that, here, the disparate associations are marshaled into rigid series<sup>19</sup>—necessitated by the pattern of the diptych. And again the explanation for Thibaudet's inclusion of the inconsequential detail is

<sup>19</sup> The habit of characterizing reality by the enumeration of disconnected traits was first developed in French literature, so far as I know, by Diderot, who had sensed so deeply the disconnected and mechanical in human behavior. He describes the master of Jacques le Fataliste as living in a state of ennui and inertia like an automaton: "il ne savait que devenir sans sa montre, sans sa tabatière, et sans Jacques: c'étaient les trois grandes ressources de sa vie, qui se passait à prendre du tabac, à regarder l'heure qu'il était, à questionner Jacques."

to be found in his deep belief in cultural totalities: it could be said that it is his respect for the enduring and basic features of historical entities that allows him to deal in such "impertinent" circumstantialities.

Another point that might be made is the fact that, of the four pairs of national traits singled out, three are never heard of again. Their presence is due, in part, of course, to Thibaudet's desire to multiply shapes, to "faire riche"; but more important, perhaps, is his desire to show, by multiplying variations on the theme "Comment peut-on être Persan?" the essential absurdity of any particular "Comment peut-on . . .?"—in this case, "Comment peut-on aimer Boileau?" For the nucleus of the comparison is, obviously, to be found in the fourth pair: Boileau *vs.* the King of England. Given the political nature of comparison, and given the republican form of government obtaining in France, Boileau (*sub specie casei*) must be seen as a President of a Republic—the Republic of Letters; that, in France, the President of Letters enjoys the same prestige which, in England, is accorded to royalty, is only another way of telling the English that literature matters less in their country than it does in France. And if the individual Boileau is compared to the permanent institution of kingship, this can only mean that Boileau is to be considered as a permanent French institution. Given the institutional character which Boileau shares with the English King, it follows, according to Thibaudet, that greatness is no prerequisite for a "representative man" (a conclusion to which Emerson, of course, would have strongly dissented).

Thibaudet makes no attempt to conceal the obvious historical facts which jar with the republican institution of President; he admits readily that Boileau was a royal creation and that the French "Republic of Letters" was, before the time of Louis XIV, instituted by the authoritarian Richelieu, who founded the Academy—or, as Thibaudet calls it, the "Parliament of Letters"; when this parliament failed to function satisfactorily, it became necessary to impose upon it a president against its will. That Thibaudet can apply the term "President" to one who is not elected, but is imposed from above, is due to the coercion exerted by the initially chosen set of oppositions (English monarchy—French republic). However, Thibaudet emphasizes the fact that Boileau, by his nature, was no authoritarian (as Chapelain, the "superacadémicien" had been, though he exercised constitutionally tempered power), but a young "militant" writer, representing the man in the street. Moreover, though Boileau was placed in office by the most authoritarian of means, his presidency was posthumously ratified by the nation (though one may think that it is a strange republic, this Republic of Letters created by Thibaudet, in which the people elects its leaders after their death).

How this elaborate and painstaking construction could materialize in Thibaudet's mind we can understand only when we read the last paragraph of the article. The rapprochement "Boileau—President of

French Letters" must have been suggested to Thibaudet by his recollection of the pre-war poll on the significance of Boileau for modern times, which had been taken among French writers. From this initial datum we may reconstruct the sequence of thoughts in Thibaudet's mind as follows:

- (a) The French intellectuals opted for Boileau before the war.
- (b) They will always opt for him.
- (c) Boileau is like a perpetual president of a society.
- (d) Of which society? of the French Republic of Letters.
- (e) In France, the Republic of Letters presided over by Boileau has a central symbolical importance, in contrast to the situation in England where the central symbol is the ever-changing King.
- (f) The French Republic of Letters was founded by autocratic royalty—but Boileau himself was no autocrat; and his position was later ratified by the French.
- (g) Boileau had three main democratic qualities: he was young, he represented the man in the street, he was a militant critic.
- (h) Thus, a reevaluation of Boileau's poetic output is indicated; it is not in the *Art Poétique*, which gives the impression of authoritarianism, but in the *Lutrin* (the critical poem par excellence) that we hear the true voice of the perpetual President of French Letters.

The whole article may be considered an apologia for Boileau, a plea for his survival, a demonstration of the *présence de Boileau*, as Thibaudet expresses it. And it is clear that this apologia is a conservative move ("nous n'avons ni envie ni motifs de modifier cet état de choses"): Thibaudet has made Boileau even more generally acceptable to Frenchmen by appealing to the two contradictory elements present in their minds, by choosing to stress a *revolutionary* note in a notorious *conservative*. Moreover, in presenting the case of Boileau, Thibaudet does not proceed as critics of other nations would be apt to do: he makes no attempt to compare Boileau's stature to that of artist critics of other nations (with Pope, for example, or Lessing), nor does he show in him a "representative man of humanity." He addresses himself exclusively to the instincts of the French: Boileau is made to appear as a French institution, glorified by that same trait which Thibaudet had admired in the Austro-Hungarian Empire: "le prestige et l'acquis d'un passé." Boileau must survive because he is so utterly, so incomparably French (the only comparison admitted with a parallel figure of another nation—the English King—is a comparison of historical survivals—which have in themselves a historical justification and a logic of their own). In order to affirm the permanency of Boileau's influence, Thibaudet proceeds to a reevaluation of his works, in which the critic is made to appear as a revolutionary forerunner of modern literary tendencies (Flaubert!), so that we are tempted to

forget the figure of Boileau as the Nemesis of the French schoolboy. What a clever move, to play off the *Lutrin* against the *Art Poétique*—which Thibaudet knew to be a *noli me tangere* of the French curriculum.

Thibaudet's criticism, like so much of French literary criticism, is one of reevaluation of the established, of reclamation of blighted areas, of reorientation in sections that have been too much visited. Renovation of the familiar is his program. The voyage of this literary critic is a large-scale "voyage autour de ma chambre." The whole of French literature and history becomes a cozy *intérieur*, made even more inhabitable to the Frenchman, in which Boileau appears as one among the cherished family *bibelots*. Thibaudet, when dealing with any particular phenomenon, sees it as framed by the *whole* of French literature—as though this whole were existing in that very moment as a solid block (although this block may have to be reaggregated ever anew according to the pattern required by each particular phenomenon; in each of his *Réflexions* a new light will be cast, determined by the momentary point of view, on the oft-rehearsed pageant of literature). If it is Racine he treats (or Victor Hugo, or Anatole France), the figures of Boileau, of Chateaubriand, of Sainte-Beuve will be sure to appear, just as we find Racine, Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo, Anatole France, Sainte-Beuve, in the essay on Boileau. The long-tended, neatly trimmed park of French Letters is illuminated by new fireworks, and by means of the pyrotechnical display new designs and colors are extracted from familiar sites.<sup>20</sup> Whoever knows his Lanson

<sup>20</sup> This is so true that it may happen that Thibaudet will utter an opinion directly opposed to one previously expressed—only because the former fits better into the "momentary aggregation." I was amazed, for example, to find, in *NRF*, XXXVIII (1932), 559, a study entitled "Le Président" in which Thibaudet states, quite at variance with the stand he took in his posthumous study on Boileau (the year of whose composition is not indicated), that France has *never* had a President of the Republic of Letters; this time, we learn that it is the Germans who have provided a President, in the person of Goethe (who is the President not only of German but of World Literature).

At the same time it is interesting to note the constancy of Thibaudet's patterns of thought even when his technique engenders contradictory results. In our study on Boileau, if our outline of stages was correct, Thibaudet must have taken as his point of departure a particular symbolical event, the pre-war poll on Boileau held among French writers; a parallel event was at hand for Thibaudet to exploit in his study of Goethe, for at the convention of the Unions Intellectuelles held in Frankfurt, Goethe had been proclaimed their president. Thibaudet refuses to see in this decision "un jeu d'esprit et un simple amusement," and he discusses seriously the claims of Goethe to such a (permanent) presidency. By means of definitions, classifications, and enumerations, according to his usual manner, Thibaudet proves to his satisfaction that Goethe has merited this honor; then he proceeds to consider the political aspects of such an office, expressing his desire that Germany, inspired with Goethian wisdom, and in conformity with its central geographical position, might occupy the presidential chair of Europe; the geographer and the literary historian in Thibaudet combine their pious wishes with those of the French man-in-the-street of 1932 who was full of foreboding over the political prospects. In this same article Thibaudet distinguishes the Presidency of Letters from two other literary offices; it is possible, states Thibaudet, to divide writers into three types, the imperial, the



by heart (and every educated Frenchman does) will marvel at the redistributions and reintegrations of the classics that are effectuated in the *Réflexions*: any one of them is a condensed "Lanson," seen from a certain angle, relieved of ponderousness, sublimated into wit; there exists potentially in Thibaudet a "Lanson" with ironical new indexes (cf. the reference to the "quatre vicomtes"). The historic flow of

royal, and the presidential: Victor Hugo is the Napoleon, Voltaire the Louis XIV, and Goethe the President among writers (in the last case Thibaudet offers no individual President as parallel—in the political field—for the very good reason that there is no political precedent for a President with an international range of power, such as Thibaudet endows Goethe with).

As for the non-existence of a French President of Letters, Thibaudet offers the following explanation:

Si en France la République des Lettres a eu son roi et son empereur, il est remarquable qu'elle n'ait jamais eu de Président. Une grande nature présidentielle, ce serait une grande nature critique, une puissante intelligence objective, familière avec tous les partis de l'esprit, habile dans l'art de les comprendre, de les consulter et de les utiliser, un arbitre honoré, armé des balances généralement et du glaive exceptionnellement, ayant d'ailleurs milité dans les partis et créé dans plusieurs genres, sinon dans tous, non assez retiré dans l'intelligence pour ne pas sentir avec des sens d'artiste et pour ne pas créer avec l'originalité du génie, mais enfin, comme un temple grec, étalant d'abord et de loin au regard un fronton compréhensif et puissant.

And then he proceeds, just as in the study on Boileau, to an elimination of competitors: in this case, of both German and French competitors: Leibniz is no artist, Taine is "un grand commis," Renan is too clerical—while Sainte-Beuve might be Secretary of State (he mentions no Russian; we may suppose that Tolstoy would have been both too clerical and too imperialistic to qualify). Incredibly enough, the name of Boileau is not even mentioned as a candidate. It is obvious that, of the two, Goethe is the better presidential timber: that Olympian Goethe whom Thibaudet was able to compare to the façade of a Greek temple—that *uomo universale* whom he characterizes in the lines above. We may surmise that the article on Goethe, dismissing as it does French claims to a President of Letters, was written earlier than the study on Boileau; the idea of a President, first suggested by the action of the convention at Frankfurt, evidently lingered in Thibaudet's mind to color his interpretation of that pre-war poll unanimous in its appreciation of Boileau, which he pretended to accept as a presidential election. Thus the central idea of his study on Boileau would derive ultimately from a previous article in which he had stated quite opposite opinions in regard to French pretensions. Can we justify this bravado which enables a writer to reach opposite results with the greatest of ease? Is not the main question whether Boileau was or was not a President? To such a question Thibaudet would perhaps have made answer that his main concern is "brasser des idées" (or, with a gastronomical simile, v. note 16, "brasser la mayonnaise"). To be alert to new relationships within the given subject matter was more important for him than to establish everlasting judgments. The very gaiety of his aperçus would suggest that Thibaudet considers his own mind as a self-invalidating instrument.

As between the two articles, I must confess that, in spite of the effort toward national impartiality which allowed Thibaudet to grant Goethe a world-presidency in contrast to the more limited powers of Boileau, and, on the other hand, in spite of the *tour de force* which was necessary in order to make of Boileau the royalist the President of a Republic, my sympathies lie more with the study on Boileau. In Thibaudet's description of his worldly, urbane dignitary, there is something incompatible with the Faustian *Forschungsdrang* of the essentially solitary Olympian of Weimar: the Goethe elected by the convention at Frankfurt was no frock-coated figure presiding from the platform, but an invisible symbol. Moreover, in Thibaudet's development of the "presidential" metaphor, I sense too much of formality, of "costume and mask": he will say, for example, of Goethe's conversations with Eckermann: "leur éternel intérêt est de nous introduire exactement (!) à l'intérieur d'un cerveau présidentiel, dans les appartements privés (!) d'un Président des idées. . . . Goethe y paraît . . . dans sa robe de



French literature is seen as a vast chess-game,<sup>21</sup> in which every pawn commands the other, and the whole situation is determined by the different pawns. Boileau is Boileau because Racine, Chateaubriand, Sainte-Beuve, Flaubert have determined his function.<sup>22</sup> The plurality of shapes and patterns goes hand in hand with that delight the critic feels and which he makes us feel in the irreducible manifoldness and kaleidoscopic multivalence of French literature. There is not in Thibaudet that hasty attempt at monotheistic integration, at the construction of ideal entities, as would be the case with most German critics.

I am somewhat puzzled at the contention of Thibaudet's compatriots that he is a Bergsonian; that, along with or independent of the French philosopher, he has rediscovered time in literary history and recreates, in his studies, the "élan vital." Nothing could be farther from my own opinion. I believe that we have to count here with a pure

chambre blanche [shades of Descartes!], un aïeul compréhensif et respecté au milieu des familles." Here, the "representative man" that Emerson saw in Goethe, that is, representative of The Writer, has become the representative French writer à la Victor Hugo or Lamartine, with all their theatrical Olympianism—not the advisor and sage, the *omnium horarum homo* that he is to the German people. Suffice it to quote here a typical modern German author commenting precisely on the worldly side of Goethe's life (Thomas Mann, *Lotte in Weimar*, p. 28):

Wir haben Schilderungen von dem Hofhalt Goethes in Weimar, wie er, nicht länger nur der Dichter bestimmter Werke, sondern ein Fürst des Lebens, der höchste Repräsentant europäischer Kultur, Gesittung und Menschlichkeit, umgeben von dem Schwarm der Sekretäre, der Höheren Gehilfen und dienenden Freunde, mit jener besternten und amtlichen Würde, die die Welt ihm auferlegte und hinter der er das Geheimnis und die Abgründe seiner Größe verbarg, dem Eustrom der zivilisierten Menschheit, der Fürsten, der Künstler, der Jugend, der schlichten Existenzen standhielt, denen das Bewußtsein, ihn haben anschauen zu dürfen, den Rest ihres Lebens vergolden mochte. . . .

I have italicized the passage in which Mann defines just *what* Goethe was "representative" of (civilization, culture, humanity), and also the one in which Goethe's official existence is opposed to his inner life with its "abysses of greatness." The officialized picture offered by Thibaudet appears trifling by comparison.

<sup>21</sup> The same simile of the chess-game has, as is well known, been applied by the French-trained Swiss scholar, F. de Saussure, to synchronic or descriptive linguistics, as opposed to the diachronic or historical linguistics of the German school of linguistics, which ultimately goes back to Romantic organicism and which insists less on the systematic than on the creative in language.

<sup>22</sup> For his framework of reference within which to locate a phenomenon, Thibaudet often needs adjectives, derived from proper names, which can lend themselves to comparison. As a general principle, the French language, contrary to Latin and Italian and German (not to mention the Slavic languages), is slow to admit such derivatives; *virgiliens*, *balsaciens*, perhaps a *hugolien* (= "like Virgil, Balzac, Hugo") have become accepted, but the individual writer is not free to coin at will according to this pattern. Thibaudet, however, though in most respects a linguistic conservative, does not recognize such a restriction; in our article we find *cette onction francienne* ("this Anatole France-like unction"—to be found in the *Lutrin*!), *la raison bolæenne* (here, the underlying Latinization of Boileau to *\*Bolaëus* has a comic ring); in an earlier note we have mentioned the expression *une acception "amiélienne"* (the quotation marks are his). I have also come across the adjective *rimbaldien* "like Rimbaud" (again a facetious Latinization). In his *Amiel*, Thibaudet speaks of the hero as a "Sainte-Beuve lémanien, staïen, cosmopolite et philosophe"; and in *RRF*, XLVII, 170, we find the phrase "une manière de discours à la fois orléaniste, sainto-beauvian et gidien." This is a striking example of a linguistic reflection of a particular *Weltanschauung*.

illusion, fostered by the fact that Thibaudet has extended the historical line of literary criticism up to our times, that he includes therein not only the *déjà fait* in literature but also the *se faisant*. With him, however, it is only a question of choice of material, not of its treatment; Thibaudet always criticizes the *se faisant* in reference to the *déjà fait*—and it could even be said that he sees the *se faisant* as something *déjà fait*.<sup>23</sup> Thibaudet stays on the dam, not within the flow of literature; never has he let himself be swept along by the stream of history nor has he made its flow the protagonist of his writings; and his style, with its ironic *floriture* and staccatoes, is ill-fitted to give the effect of an irresistibly forward-driving *élan vital*. Quite to the contrary of the Bergsonian approach, in Thibaudet's writings the tide of history is stemmed, subjected to a system of references or coördinates which stands above the flow of history.<sup>24</sup> His article on Boileau is significant in this regard: instead of any flow of literature, we see French Letters forever ruled by the figure of a President—like a successful Canute. And when Thibaudet does pass history in review, as in his attempt to find, in the period from Richelieu to our day, the moment when the idea of the "President" has crystallized, there is no espousal with him of the historical development; rather, he imposes upon it a rational definition (was Guez de Balzac, was Chapelain, was Boileau—was anyone after Boileau—a "real" President?). And the final sentence, so reminiscent of the average attitude of the members of a conservative club, "Le président reste le Président," is a confession that Thibaudet is more greatly concerned with the preservation of the historically crystallized than with the process of time unfolding and rolling toward new undreamed-of shores in its irrational infinitude. Thibaudet is a genius of the finite.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Compare Thibaudet's remark, quoted by Bergson: "Rien n'est plus difficile qu'un bon moderne, de l'être avec mesure et justesse d'esprit, de sentir et goûter son temps dans son mouvement, dans son être immédiat et labile, au lieu de vivre comme lorsqu'on est un ancien, dans un monde de choses toutes faites." Note that Thibaudet speaks of the *difficulty* of living one's time while it is still in flux.

<sup>24</sup> Valéry writes of Thibaudet: "Personne n'était mieux doué que lui pour l'art de créer des perspectives dans l'énorme forêt des Lettres." Bergson himself says of Thibaudet's book "Bergsonisme": "s'il lui arrive de refaire le voyage que j'ai fait tout d'une traite, il s'arrête, lui, à chaque rond-point dans la traversée d'une ville, à chaque croix forestière s'il est en forêt, également captivé par l'art et la nature. . . . Il a travaillé dans un espace à deux dimensions, alors que le mien n'en avait qu'une." Both writers, independently of each other, have found the simile of "orientation in a forest" to apply to Thibaudet's writing. And Bergson's statement indicates clearly that he finds Thibaudet little interested in the "natural" flow of time.

<sup>25</sup> It is precisely when Thibaudet uses one of Bergson's own concepts that the difference between the two thinkers stands out most clearly. In his characterization of the treaty of Versailles (quoted by E.-R. Curtius) as lacking in respect for the organic necessities of the various countries, Thibaudet contrasts the "mechanical" principle with the "vital," by comparing the manner in which the countries were cut up, with the way in which chicken is carved by the chefs in

There can even be discerned in his writings a development in the course of the years away from the organicism of his earlier years: in his book on Mallarmé he had sought to reduce every feature of Mallarmé's poetry (even the blanks on the page, the lack of punctuation, etc.) to a central vision of the being called "Mallarmé"; and the particular poetic manifestations which Thibaudet pointed out were shown to be suggestive of the whole of this being, symphonically fused with it. In that book Thibaudet was inspired by respect for the singular organism Mallarmé which he contrasted with other organisms, but whose unity he jealously respected.

But even here Thibaudet presented his protagonist more as a static being than as an Antheic force ever renewing itself. A true Bergsonian would have seen in the poet more the organically evolving *élan* than his organized, static being (though, as a matter of fact, such a critic would not have been apt to choose Mallarmé, in the first place: this sage beyond evolution who seems to have clearly known from the beginning his location and the range of his poetic force). And the conviction of the presence of an organic force in a poet could, with a true Bergsonian critic, have then been transferred to the historical movement in which the particular poet was involved. The particular movement which he unleashed or helped to develop would then have appeared as an organic whole, comparable to a person whose every manifestation would have to be referred to its central *élan*.

The contrary happens regularly in the writings of Thibaudet: in his *Réflexions* he dethrones every historical individual from his dominating place, shows his connection with others<sup>26</sup> before, with, and after him, and places him within the framework of his timeless, stemmed history, of his deterministic geography and sociology. The perennial President, Boileau, whom Thibaudet offers us, is not the organically growing individual in his incalculable flow (as is the Goethe pictured by Gundolf), nor is he the main protagonist in the organical growth of his period (as Goethe is presented in Korff's "Geist der Goethezeit").<sup>27</sup> Thibaudet's Boileau is rather the timeless allegory of French

cheap restaurants, who carve mechanically instead of following the "lines of life." From Bergson, Thibaudet has borrowed his opposition, but the metaphor, which he handles so vividly, is his own: one feels that the distinction he offers is derived directly from an actual dismembered fowl which he has visualized.

<sup>26</sup> Ramon Fernandez writes: "Nul plus que lui ne s'avisait à propos de toute chose, de ce qui est *autre*. Le mécanisme naturel de sa pensée était la compensation des oublis." He states also that every article of Thibaudet's consists in a double movement, toward and away from the subject matter in question, the latter movement being necessitated by the tendency to think in terms of "otherness." Fernandez, somewhat in the manner of Thibaudet himself, derives the latter's habit of mind from geography: "Par son pays, sa race et sa nature, Thibaudet était un esprit mitoyen. . . Pays mitoyen, Tournus. . ." This is the reason that Thibaudet, along with the other writers for the *NRF*, could be described by Claudel as a mind "sans pente."

<sup>27</sup> So little was this Thibaudet's genuine approach that when he had to write a history of French literature, he broke this down into "generations," that is, he used the most obvious of the naturalistic devices offered to a historian.

literature as a whole, an abiding, suprahistorical phenomenon. The "presidential" metaphor itself is drawn from outside (from social life, from club life): what does it reflect of Boileau's inner being—for example, of his aspirations to classical balance, of the equilibrium he achieved between poetry and rationality, of his religious needs as expressed in the epistle on the love of God, for which writing Thibaudet shows no great enthusiasm? In Boileau's dictum "Aimez donc la raison," Thibaudet prefers to see only the "limitative" aspect of Boileau's rationality, while a critic more concerned with Boileau's nature would have insisted on the deep emotion with which Boileau hails reason. Thibaudet's very predilection for striking, random similes made acceptable by wit<sup>28</sup> is the opposite of a striving for organic metaphors drawn from the inner nature of the poet himself. What he sees is "appearance": he shows us how Boileau appeared to his contemporaries, how he appears to us (and to Thibaudet), how he will appear to Frenchmen in the future—not how he was (and is). It is the consciousness of a timeless literary heritage that stimulates Thibaudet to write; he cultivates "son jardin"<sup>29</sup>—which is a most finite entity for the Frenchman, and no mystical garden in which union with the Infinite may take place.

Among the inorganic metaphors to which Thibaudet has recourse, we find here, just as in the essay on the League of Nations, subsidiary metaphors indicated by the momentary context. The idea of the critical poet who feeds on the works of others suggested to Thibaudet a comparison between secondary literature, which feeds on primary literature, and the parasitic mistletoe—and immediately Thibaudet's historical memory is stimulated to associate therewith the Druids of old. In the category he constructs of "la littérature-gui," he includes, as one of the progeny of that "secondary" literature supposedly originating from the *Lutrin*, Chateaubriand's *Les Martyrs*—of which a considerable part is given up to the description of Druidic civilization. Again, in the wake of the "presidential" metaphor, we find references introduced to the maneuverings of French political elections: "une

<sup>28</sup> This procedure should not be confused with cases in which the incongruities chosen by Thibaudet are meant to symbolize and to criticize the inorganic nature of the phenomenon he describes. Maurois, for example, objects to the following sentence from Thibaudet's *Flaubert* in which the critic, dealing with a juvenile work of the novelist, remarks: "Les déclamations de Rolla viennent ici relayer les *Confessions*, et la philosophie de jeune homme est à peu près celle des *Blasphèmes* de Richopin, c'est à dire celle d'un Homais qui aurait bu l'alcool de son verre à ténia"—evidently without sensing that this sarcastic accumulation of incongruent titles is intended to mimic the incongruities of the work Thibaudet is criticizing.

<sup>29</sup> Never would a German critic see in a great poet a "system of references," a source of ready-made quotations, a network of possible applications for the definition of situations; rather would he speak of such things as the "bildende Kräfte" which have formed the writer and which may inspire and transform us through him. I am reminded in this connection of the remark of a fellow scholar I happened to overhear: "Schiller is full of quotations"—which reveals a striking confusion of the secondary with the primary.

opposition de couloirs à la Briand," "l'ironie que Clémenceau a pu mettre à voter pour Loubet." These metaphors are anachronistic (Sainte-Beuve and Flaubert, who are here in question as voting for Boileau, did not live at the time of Briand and Clémenceau), or rather they are timeless metaphors, in which the political combinations of our time become typological and thus applicable to Boileau. Reflecting, as they do, our immediate, "inhabited" present, they serve to make remote periods equally habitable, they draw history close to us—a history filled with shapes drawn from Thibaudet's familiar environment. Thus, for example, Chapelain, who was not the elected president of the Academy but a superimposed bureaucrat, is described by Thibaudet (who had lived in Geneva) as "modérateur de l'Académie au sens où l'on était à Genève modérateur de la Compagnie des pasteurs."<sup>30</sup>

To sum up: the plenitude of our world, joyfully accepted by the writer, is what informs Thibaudet's patterns of thought. His world in its variety and whimsicality has as its primordial principle, not the Heraclitean flux but the Eleatic "being." This world is there for Thibaudet to muse upon: *est, ergo cogitemus*. Unlike Taine, he gives no "reasons" for historical development; he is content to point out the relationships within the historically given—although, like Taine, he sees history as determined. No historical pessimist as was Taine, he

<sup>30</sup> Here, the inspiration is exclusively verbal; in the same article Thibaudet remarks that Boileau was "l'homme de la rue," not "... de la ruelle." For Thibaudet the play on words is necessary as offering one of those double-tracks on which his imagination is allowed to roll forward. Ramon Fernandez points out the deep meaning underlying Thibaudet's witticism: "pour écrire *le Rouge et le Noir*, il fallait que Stendhal eût vu le rose et le brun." The idea that, in order to represent extremes, the novelist had first to have experienced the intermediate stages, is rendered by means of a projection on a second plane, that of the spectrum. In the (posthumously published) *Histoire de la littérature française depuis 1789 jusqu'à nos jours* (1936), the proportion of verbal juggling seems to have considerably increased; in the discussion of Taine we find: "durant les trente dernières années du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle le tétrasyllabe Taine-et-Renan rendait dans la langue des lettres un son indivisible comme Tarn-et-Garonne"; "[Taine] Entré premier à l'Ecole Normale—cacique, selon le langage de la maison—il est resté le cacique de la formation universitaire française, à la manière dont Hugo serait le cacique de la poésie et Bossuet celui de l'épiscopat"; Taine's *Origines* "est un livre de classe au sens social, mais c'est aussi un livre de classe, de grande classe, au sens littéraire."

Thibaudet delights in the foursomes created by two converging shapes and two converging names. This enjoyment of the fortuitous is a healthy reaction against the determinism imposed on us by those natural scientists who consider in nature only its laws. Scientists of a more humanistic type have felt the same impulse as did Thibaudet: Robert Williams Wood, in his fantastic "flornithology" entitled "How to Tell the Birds from the Flowers," while purporting to distinguish these species, in reality makes their shapes interchangeable in his drawings and chooses quasi-homonymous names to further confuse them ("the crow" and "the crocus"). His is as deep an enjoyment of fortuitous convergences, linguistic and natural, as was that of the medieval etymologically minded naturalist; and he has recourse to the etymological pun so characteristic, for example, of Isidore of Seville: "(The Clover—The Plover) . . . for ento-molo-gists aver, / the Bee can be in Clover, / while ety-molo-gists concur, / there is no B in Plover."

can enjoy history and find it vastly entertaining; and, with his own spiritual turbulence, he will find ways to enliven its presentation. There may be with Thibaudet a Barrèsian acceptance of history—though without the exclusivism or fanaticism of Barrès:<sup>31</sup> national historical determination is not felt by Thibaudet as a palladium to be desperately defended; he accepts the fact of this determination easily and with quiet confidence. And all existing historical entities are seen by Thibaudet as patterned on that unquestionable and most enjoyable reality of realities: France. He possesses what Ernst Bertram has called the *Seinsrealismus* of the Romance peoples. To the German mind an idea becomes easily the Platonic Idea, with a halo of its own, inspiring reverence; and, sensitive to its dynamic imperative, he hastens to make reality conform with the "idea" of the moment—and may, out of "passion for the idea," violate reality. But with the Frenchman the existing reality as such invites something of the awe of a pre-ordained Platonic idea, and, accordingly, must be "maintained" in order not to betray the *idea* of the existing. And, in this way, he, too, may run counter to the requirements of reality.

There is no doubt that in our times both great civilized people, Germany and France, have catastrophically failed reality—each of them out of a misinterpreted Platonism, wrongly applied, in the two contrary ways just described, to what they considered "ideas." But there can be no doubt that the unfanatical, well-balanced, happy nature of Thibaudet was more aware of the preciousness of our civilization than were the one-sided, chiliastic, fundamentally unhappy intellectuals *d'outre-Rhin* who were his contemporaries. So true is it that happiness is an essential ingredient of civilization. Thibaudet belongs to that compact French civilization which gives us delight by its own happiness.

Johns Hopkins University

<sup>31</sup> While Thibaudet has in common with Barrès the propensity to historical symbolization and allegorization, the symbols of the latter are taken more seriously; they are followed through in book after book, and are meant to serve his French readers as constant reminders of basic truths too easily forgotten (e.g., "Lorraine living under the eye of the Barbarian"). The symbols of Thibaudet are rather "nonce-symbols," *Augenblicksgötter*, springing up at the bid of the moment and at the whim of the writer.



## MOLE'S INTERPRETATION OF MOLIERE'S MISANTHROPE

By EDWARD D. SULLIVAN

Of the many actors who have played Alceste in Molière's *Misanthrope* Molé is particularly interesting because, in many ways, he sums up the attitude of the chief eighteenth-century actors toward the role. Although he added a vigor and a violence of his own to Alceste, which gave the illusion that he was closer to Molière's interpretation, his *Misanthrope* follows essentially the tradition set by Baron and carried on by Grandval, Bellecourt, and others.<sup>1</sup>

Molé's theatrical career extended over the second half of the eighteenth century. He was accepted as *sociétaire* in 1761, but it was not until 1778, at the death of Bellecourt, that he came into possession of the major roles in comedy. Although considered unsuited to tragedy, he won a brilliant reputation in comedy, and was one of the few actors who welcomed the "drame" of Diderot and his followers. Throughout his entire career Molé was noted for his extremely energetic style of acting: "Il joue tout comme un furieux, comme un enragé," remarked Collé in 1780.<sup>2</sup> After his death in 1802, he was long remembered chiefly for this fiery quality, and his successors, especially Fleury, were judged by the standard of sustained vitality that he had set.

As Alceste in the *Misanthrope* his success was very great, and he played it many times during his long career. Even before Bellecourt's death he attempted the role, but his first efforts were not especially noteworthy. In 1778, while Bellecourt was still alive, he tried again; and although the *Nouveau Spectateur* praised his manner of singing the "Chanson du Roi Henri," he was said not to have "assez d'aplomb et de noblesse" nor did he possess "la science du caractère."<sup>3</sup>

When, after Bellecourt's death, he took over the role, he played it with more assurance, and laid the foundations for his great reputation as the *Misanthrope*. Speaking of this period, one observer remarks:

<sup>1</sup> The history of the *Misanthrope* on the stage is discussed briefly in the Despois and Mesnard edition of *Œuvres de Molière* (Paris, 1880), V, 394 ff. Their account of Molé mentions merely his vigorous style without attempting to relate his interpretation to that of Baron and other eighteenth-century actors. The stage interpretation of the *Misanthrope* in the first half of the eighteenth century has been treated by this writer in "The Actors' Alceste: Evolution of the *Misanthrope*," *MLQ*, IX (March, 1948), 74-89.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Collé, *Journal et Mémoires* (Paris, 1868), I, 437 n., and III, 238. See also Louis Petit de Bachaumont, *Mémoires Secrets*, I, 167 (January 17, 1763).

<sup>3</sup> *Journal des Théâtres ou le Nouveau Spectateur*, IV, 221, quoted in *Œuvres de Molière*, ed. Despois and Mesnard, V, 405.



Cette chaleur de jeunesse qu'il conserva toute sa vie, ne nuisit pas à ses succès, même dans les rôles graves. Elle était d'un effet excellent dans le rôle du Misanthrope, rôle passionné s'il en est, et que Bellecour jouait avec moins d'empchement que d'humeur.<sup>4</sup>

As he grew older, his acting was criticized more and more severely, but there seemed to be general agreement that in one play at least, the *Misanthrope*, he retained his old fire: "Il ne reste guère de tous les rôles qu'il jouait autrefois, que le Misanthrope qui puisse encore lui convenir."<sup>5</sup> Divine and sublime are the adjectives used to characterize Molé's Alceste in the last years of his life, although in his other roles he was often ridiculous.<sup>6</sup> One laudatory critic, writing several years after Molé's death, can offer no higher praise than to say that Molé interpreted the role in the way Molière himself had played it:

Qu'il était sublime dans le *Misanthrope*! Dans ce rôle savant et précieux, Molé par sa manière d'envisager et de saisir ce caractère, parut aux connaisseurs avoir surpassé le plus grand nombre de ses prédécesseurs, et de se rapprocher mieux de l'intention de Molière.<sup>7</sup>

This is precisely the question we are chiefly concerned with in this discussion of Molé. To what extent does he represent a break with the eighteenth-century tradition of the role which derives from Baron? How close is his interpretation to what we know of Molière's treatment of Alceste on the stage?<sup>8</sup> It is true that, superficially at least, certain aspects of Molé's version seem close to Molière's, but, as we shall see, his basic conception of the role was different, and a number of essential elements were lacking.

Molé, like Baron and Grandval before him, was unwilling to appear ridiculous on the stage, unwilling even in a comedy part to represent a character who would be the subject of the audience's laughter. Even when he played a "marquis ridicule," of the type so mercilessly satirized by Molière, it was noted that he embellished the role, playing down the exaggerated and comical mannerisms in order to make the character less ridiculous. This was said to be the result of "l'habitude qu'il avait du grand monde,"<sup>9</sup> but it was simply second nature to this elegant actor. So great was Molé's popularity that he was imitated by the very types he was portraying on the stage. Ricord speaks of his "chaleur entraîante" in the *Misanthrope*, and adds:

<sup>4</sup> Antoine-Vincent Arnault, *Les Souvenirs et les regrets du vicil amateur dramatique* (Paris, 1829), p. 76.

<sup>5</sup> *Sur l'Etat actuel du Théâtre de la République par un amateur qui a vu, qui voit, et qui lit dans l'avenir* (Paris, 1802), An X, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> See *L'Espion des Coulisses* (Paris, 1800), An VIII, pp. 27-28, and J. P. A. Rémusat, *Le Coup de Fouet* (Paris, 1802), p. 69.

<sup>7</sup> *Etranges de Thalie* (Paris, 1811), p. 50.

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of Molière in the role of Alceste, see my article "The Actors' Alceste" mentioned above.

<sup>9</sup> Alexandre Ricord, *Les Fastes de la Comédie-Française* (1821), I, 210.

"Rempli de noblesse, d'élégance et de grâce, Molé donnait le ton aux petits-maitres de la cour; et il fut même le modèle des gens qualifiés qui avaient besoin d'avoir de la dignité sans afféterie."<sup>10</sup> Yet one may well wonder if this Alceste, who was a model of courtly manners, really resembled the stern and uncompromising Alceste of Molière, who was so ill at ease in polite society. Whatever the merits of Alceste's attack on insincerity and his desire to reform social convention, it does not appear that he converted many of his contemporaries. That Molé, as Alceste, could serve as a model of courtly behavior indicates something of the transformation of the *Misanthrope* in the eighteenth century.

Molé's Alceste is wrathful, vigorous, violent, but never ridiculous. He is the hero of the piece, a charming, noble, sincere, and honest fellow, who captures the sympathy of the audience from the start. Molière's *Misanthrope* is a sympathetic character, but it is precisely because of his admirable qualities that we are amused by his exaggerations, by his stubbornness, and by his constantly getting involved in difficulties of his own creation, which with a little common sense could easily have been avoided. He is a very human character, and we are somehow aware that he is of far greater stature than he makes himself out to be. But if Alceste is the perfect hero, as Molé made him, then Philinte must necessarily be a treacherous villain, and Célimène has no reason for not accepting Alceste. This, of course, brings to mind immediately Rousseau's criticism of Molière, for Jean-Jacques not only saw Alceste as a hero, but himself as Alceste. It is not without significance that Molé was the actor who played Alceste in Fabre d'Eglantine's play *Le Philinte de Molière*, a sequel to the *Misanthrope* inspired by the ideas of Rousseau.<sup>11</sup> He was able to fit into his role in the new play with the greatest of ease, for it was essentially the character he had been portraying in Molière's play.

One spectator's description of Molé's performance brings out unintentionally the essential contradiction to be found in his conception of the character:

C'était du premier vers au dernier une verve qui dominait tout. Que les lenteurs de Philinte et ses éternelles transactions avec le vice étaient fatigantes! et combien il était difficile de concevoir l'hésitation de Célimène pour accepter le don d'un cœur amoureux où siégeaient si à découvert tant d'honnêteté et de noble indépendance!<sup>12</sup>

It is not difficult to see that an interpretation such as Molé's would make the role of Célimène completely incomprehensible. Has she any

<sup>10</sup> Ricord, *op. cit.*, I, 209. See also Bachaumont, *op. cit.*, I, 32, and Charles Guillaume Etienne, *Vie de Molé* (Paris, 1803), p. 127.

<sup>11</sup> P. F. N. Fabre d'Eglantine, *Le Philinte de Molière ou la suite du Misanthrope*, presented at the Théâtre-Français February 22, 1790.

<sup>12</sup> *Soixante ans du Théâtre-français par un amateur né en 1769* (Paris, 1842), pp. 33-34.

reason at all to refuse so excellent a man, who is not only honest and likable, but also a model of courtly manners? The Célimène of Molière is blind to Alceste's qualities, and sees only his exaggerated faults; consequently, she is perfectly consistent with herself as a coquette in not looking beyond his superficial characteristics and in refusing him. But Molé's Alceste seems to have no faults at all; his violence is always noble, his wrath that of a gentleman; he has the beau rôle, and it is the victims of his anger who are made to look ridiculous.

A fiery violence was the chief feature of Molé's acting in the *Misanthrope*, and one old actor insisted that "Il lui partait des étincelles de ses manchettes,"<sup>13</sup> but it was always a noble and heroic violence. Grimod de la Reynière's detailed and enthusiastic account of one of Molé's performances shows clearly what Molé did to the rôle.<sup>14</sup> He admired especially the third scene of Act IV, in which Alceste accuses Célimène of writing a letter to Oronte. Molé played the scene boiling with the justifiable anger of a deceived lover, thundering against the base conduct of coquettish Célimène. He sought to win the admiration of the audience, and he succeeded. Everyone was on his side, and felt great sorrow at his plight.

Tour-a-tour, emporté, faible, amant passionné et jaloux, M. Molé a saisi les nuances de cette admirable scène avec un art au-dessus de toute espèce d'éloges. Son jeu était vraiment sublime, et les mots nous manquent pour le louer dignement.

Molé's treatment of this scene suggests the technique of the "drame," and it is well to recall that he was, in the words of Félix Gaiffe, "l'acteur-type du Drame."<sup>15</sup> The *Misanthrope* may be a comedy, but there are situations which should move the audience to tears, according to Grimod de la Reynière, and Molé's delivery of the speech, "Ah, ne plaisantez point, il n'est pas temps de rire" (lines 1286 ff.), was given in so pathetic a fashion as to leave no one in the theater dry-eyed. "Quelle véhémence il a mise dans ces vers terribles, et qui doivent déchirer la poitrine de tout homme qui les sent, comme Molière les a écrits!"

But Molière's treatment of this scene seems to have been quite different, if we can believe the letter of Donneau de Visé. It is "toute sérieuse," says he, "et cependant il y en a peu dans la pièce qui divertissent davantage."<sup>16</sup> Molière's Alceste is a wrathful lover, who is nevertheless handled with the greatest of ease by Célimène. He is jealous and full of anger, and nothing can calm his fury; yet not only is his fury calmed, but he pleads with the woman he is accusing,

<sup>13</sup> E. Legouvé, "A propos du *Misanthrope*," in *Le Temps*, June 26, 1896.

<sup>14</sup> A. B. L. Grimod de la Reynière, *Le Censeur dramatique*, I, No. 6 (30 vend., 1798), An VI, 349-52.

<sup>15</sup> Félix Gaiffe, *Le Drame en France au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1910), pp. 525-27.

<sup>16</sup> *Œuvres de Molière*, ed. Despois and Mesnard, V, 437.

begging her to defend herself. Again, as in the scene of the sonnet, the comedy comes from the disproportion between Alceste's violent words and his actions. The fact that he behaves as any man in love behaves only makes the affair more amusing to the spectators, who were already a little skeptical when Alceste so elaborately announced how angry he was.

Pour moi [says Donneau de Visé], je ne puis assez m'étonner, quand je vois une coquette ramener, avant que s'être justifiée, non pas un amant soumis et languissant, mais un Misanthrope, et l'obliger non-seulement à la prière de se justifier, mais encore à des protestations d'amour, qui n'ont pour but que le bien de l'objet aimé; et cependant demeurer ferme, après l'avoir ramené, et ne le point éclaircir pour avoir le plaisir de s'applaudir d'un plein triomphe.<sup>17</sup>

Alceste, in spite of his superhuman theories, turns out to be an ordinary mortal, and the audience, however sympathetic toward him, cannot fail to be amused. Molé's Alceste, on the other hand, dominates the situation completely with his justifiable anger, and then pitifully seeks the sympathy of the audience in his tragic plight. The comedy is gone, and we are witnessing a performance which is more in the spirit of the "drame" or of the romantic theater than in the spirit of Molière.

In spite of the somewhat excessive vigor of his acting, Molé maintained intact the tradition of a noble, sympathetic, heroic, essentially noncomic Alceste which went back to Baron's performances between 1720 and 1729. As Baron had done, he turned the simple "Chanson du Roi Henri" into a virtuoso exercise in sentimentality.<sup>18</sup> The public did not laugh at Molé's Alceste; they admired him, for Molé, like Baron, portrayed a man who was always in the right, and who had no faults or even peculiarities. Molé carried the audience away by the fury of his acting, and no one was given a chance to laugh at the *Misanthrope*. One could laugh at the discomfiture of his opponents, but not at him. He is either the master of the situation or else a sorrowful figure of tragedy, crushed by fate and superhuman forces. Molière's Alceste, even though an admirable person in many ways, is, nevertheless, a figure of comedy, for he is perpetually struggling to get out of situations which are created by him when he attempts to apply his rigid and rather impractical principles. His defeat is brought about not by Fate, but by his own folly. To the eighteenth-century actors, and Molé is no exception, Alceste was no longer a character of comedy, but rather a dramatic hero. The nineteenth-century actors, aided by romantic criticism of the play, completed the transformation, making Molière's *Misanthrope* a starkly tragic figure whose misfortunes suggest those of Molière himself.

*Princeton University*

<sup>17</sup> *Œuvres de Molière*, ed. Despois and Mesnard, V, 438.

<sup>18</sup> *Soixante ans du Théâtre-français par un amateur né en 1769*, p. 37.

## REVIEWS

*The Palmerin Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction.* By MARY PATCHELL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947. Pp. xiii + 157. \$2.50.

During the latter years of the sixteenth century Anthony Munday, with an eye on the English market, plundered the languid Spanish and Portuguese romance cycles. He was one remove from the Peninsula in language, for he used French translations; he was far distant from the Peninsula in feeling, for unlike Don Quixote, who loved Palmerin with Spanish sensibility, he was a commercially inclined purveyor to the rising middle classes. Between 1581 and 1592 he published *Palladine of England*, *Gerileon of England*, and the first two parts of *Palmerin of England*, all of them as closely related to the national feeling which they flattered as those nineteenth-century German novels which exploited the Wild West. Only the last of these was a member of the Palmerin cycle, which is Miss Patchell's main concern; but Munday continued with others between 1588 and 1597: *Palmerin d'Oliva*, *Palmendos*, and *Primaleon of Greece*. *Palmerin of England* appeared in an omnibus volume with a third part in 1596, and the omnibus principle was repeated for the other three Palmerin titles in 1619, when Munday also purveyed his translation of *Amadis of Gaul*, the prototype of the whole group. Munday's Palmerin has been little studied; his once well-thumbed volumes have been ignored of late because of their inaccessibility, "the monotony and absurdity of their subject matter, the very poor typography . . . and their excessive length." Miss Patchell has used the set in the possession of the Huntington Library—"five quarto volumes of some 3,075 pages printed in black letter."

Miss Patchell herself implies that it will be long before another student pays these romances antiquarian attention; she does not fall into the error of overestimating their worth. After a brief account of the history of the cycle, she discusses narrative motifs and concludes that medieval romances do these things much better. She indicates how the courtly love tradition, heretical and adulterous (but when genuine a major triumph of the human reason over irrational impulse), has become a half-sensational, half-didactic façade for the bourgeois attitude towards marriage, and she comments on the cycle's broken literary technique, fallen from medieval heights and only slightly buoyed up in its descent by a few Renaissance puffs of wind. Her most valuable chapter lists the other composite romances of Elizabethan translators, Francis Kirkman, Emanuel Forde, R. P. Gent., Henry Robarts, Christopher Middleton, Richard Johnson (who has a somewhat charming Gothic quality), and Barnabe Riche, and demonstrates the elusive influence of Palmerin upon these and greater men like Spenser, Sidney, and Shakespeare. There is an index, which may prove useful to busy folklorists and historians, and a bibliography,

which lacks such likely titles as Dunlop's *History of Prose Fiction*, the fine recent studies by William and Malleville Haller on the Puritan adaptation of courtly love to marriage, Huizinga's *Waning of the Middle Ages*, Rollins' essay on the transformation of Criseyde to Cressida, and Van de Voort's revelation of how Middle English romancers, Chaucer alone excepted, bowdlerized their Continental sources.

The shortcomings of this book light up the puzzling dilemma of the literary student. If that student is a critic, concerned primarily with subjective or scientific aesthetic judgments, he will rarely concern himself with such a mess of whitefish caviar as the Palmerin cycle. Perhaps he ought to, but he is distracted by the small results of labor, which are likely to add up to the conclusion that Munday's Palmerin is neither very good nor very illuminating to the student of artistic genesis and meaning. If, on the other hand, he is a literary historian, he has special duties, rigorous and methodical. He will do his best to assure other scholars that his patient study in remote corners need not be repeated. If he is a folklorist, he will classify narrative motifs instead of listing them casually; he will not content himself with mention of Thompson's *Motif-Index*, but he will use its system and its God-given plenty. If he is a historian of ideas, he will seek to explain why an aristocratic romance from Spain became the pabulum of London prentices; he will not merely say that the bourgeois have bad taste, but will try to find out just why certain forms of bad taste appealed to the English middle classes. If he is a student of stylistics, he will use linguistic method to discover why Anthony Munday and Peninsular romance leave us cold, and why the best chivalric romance does something else again. If he is a student of sources and influences, he will concern himself with the *chansons de geste* and the Oriental composites, as well as with the Arthurian material, which was only one of the hoards pilfered by Palmerin. If he is a bibliographer, he will give us the gospel according to McKerrow. Much of this may be dull, charted, lexical, numbered, statistical. But it will tell us something concrete. When one studies an exhausting work, one must be exhaustive. It is impossible to make Palmerin, at least in his transformation by Munday, thoroughly interesting, even when one has a pleasant style and a critical taste, as Miss Patchell does. But the cycle can be made a social document, a linguistic treasury, or a form of literary evidence. One should not fall between the stools of aesthetic criticism and literary history. The exponents of both have wide jaws under their grandmotherly nightcaps.

FRANCIS LEE UTLEY

Ohio State University

*Shakespeare's History Plays.* By E. M. W. TILLYARD. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946. Pp. viii + 336. \$3.00.

In writing *Shakespeare's History Plays* Mr. Tillyard seems to have had three purposes: (1) to study the historical and literary sources of the plays, and especially the development of the interpretation of his-



tory which they embody; (2) to demonstrate in them the influence of the complex of ideas which he outlined in his *Elizabethan World Picture*, and to establish Shakespeare as a philosophical and historical thinker at the time when they were written; and (3) to attempt a critical interpretation of the individual plays, pursuing the two preceding lines of thought but not necessarily restricting himself to them. He pays little or no attention to dramatic technique and concerns himself almost exclusively with the thought of the plays—perhaps too exclusively, for surely considerations of stage presentation modified Shakespeare's treatment of history.

The study of Shakespeare's historical background is perhaps the most effective part of his book, for Mr. Tillyard has done an excellent job of tracing the development of the historical concepts that appear in Shakespeare's plays, and especially the growth of the "Tudor myth." By a skillful choice of quotations he has managed to illustrate the respective shares of Polydore Vergil, Hall, and Holinshed clearly without sacrificing brevity. The account of Hall amplifies existing evidence that his influence upon Shakespeare, quite apart from that exerted through Holinshed, extended both to fundamental concepts and to numerous details of action and of poetry. So effective a summary of present scholarship should encourage further investigation of the details of Shakespeare's indebtedness to Hall.

The chapters on "The Literary Background," whether in *The Mirror for Magistrates* (Spenser, Sidney, and Warner are only mentioned) or in the morality and chronicle plays, consider only the use and interpretation of historical material. Within these limits they are, again, a useful and stimulating survey.

Mr. Tillyard seems to me much less successful in demonstrating that the concept of world order is "the necessary setting of the histories" (p. 10) and that, in using it as the foundation of his interpretation of history, Shakespeare "allies himself to the more philosophical writers of his day" (p. 319). It is impossible to argue the point at length in the space available, but two observations will perhaps suggest the basis of my dissent.

In the first place, Mr. Tillyard uses the famous speech on order or degree from *Troilus and Cressida*, written perhaps in 1602, as his point of departure and cites a number of passages from the chronicle plays (written ca. 1590-1598) which he regards as embodying the same ideas. But a candid examination will show, I believe, that these lines do not go beyond a statement of the divine right of kings or the lawlessness resulting from rebellion. Nowhere in the historical plays does Shakespeare state the fundamental metaphysical concept of an ordered universe as he does in *Troilus*. His statements on rebellion do involve a logical inference from this concept, but he need not himself have made the inference, since the ideas that he expresses in the histories could easily have been derived from the Elizabethan homilies or other popular sources. Shakespeare surely grew intellectually as well as dramatically, and it seems to me unsafe to read ideas from his mature works into his earlier ones. If the full metaphysical concept was an old idea to him, why did he first elaborate it in *Troilus* in a



context when it was no more appropriate than it would have been during the discussions of rebellion in the histories?

There are also weaknesses in the attempt to make Shakespeare a profound historical scholar. Here *King John* is crucial, in that Shakespeare was following an extant play, *The Troublesome Raigne*, and might either confine himself to the dramatic source or show a genuine interest in history by further research in the chronicles. Mr. Tillyard is aware of this problem and is driven to offer the hypothesis, on the questionable authority of W. J. Courthope (p. 134), that *The Troublesome Raigne* may be "a bad quarto . . . not of *King John* as we have it but of an early play of Shakespeare on the same theme" (p. 217). Yet he ignores the abundant evidence, summarized by J. Dover Wilson in the preface to New Cambridge *King John*, that Shakespeare repeatedly misunderstood the old play and introduced errors where it was historically accurate. Mr. Tillyard also writes: "In the character of the Bastard Shakespeare achieves an astonishing break-away from his official self, and through it he develops two weighty political themes which give the play its proper and effective value as part of a great historical series" (p. 229). But the Bastard, together with the weighty themes, was merely elaborated from the source. In short, Shakespeare, here at least, was completely indifferent to history. The hypothesis that he followed his sources intelligently, though not always carefully, and deviated from them primarily to achieve an actable plot or effective characters, seems to me adequate to explain the histories as they stand. Mr. Tillyard's own comparison between Shakespeare and Daniel's *Civil Wars* (pp. 238-41) seems to me to involve an almost willful avoiding of the obvious conclusion that Daniel was interested in history and Shakespeare in personalities.

It would be ungracious to end this discussion without recognizing that Mr. Tillyard's analyses of individual plays continually offer valuable interpretations or comments. I noted, among other points, the discussion of the Gardener's function in *Richard II* (p. 250), the comparison of the two parts of *Henry IV* (pp. 265 ff.), which I find completely convincing, and the entire chapter on *Macbeth* (pp. 315-18), a play which is certainly written in terms of a concept of world order whether the histories be or not.

There are apparently minor errors in the index, which should be corrected in the next edition. For example, the second page entry under *Richard III*, *True Tragedy of*, should be 106, and the reference to the same play on page 157 has been indexed under *True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*. A clearer note on the latter play and on the *Contention of York and Lancaster* would be helpful.

VIRGIL K. WHITAKER

Stanford University

*Homer in English Criticism: The Historical Approach in the Eighteenth Century.* By DONALD M. FOERSTER. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947. Pp. vi + 130. \$3.00.

This book, a revision of a doctoral dissertation (Yale, 1941), presents a survey of Homeric criticism from the restoration to the end of the eighteenth century. The first two chapters cover rather sketchily the critics of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, with special emphasis on the quarrel between ancients and moderns. Chapter three is devoted to Thomas Blackwell's *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* (1735), chapters four and five to "Scotch Criticism after 1750" and to "English Historical Interpretations," and chapter six to Robert Wood's *Essay upon the Original Genius and Writings of Homer* (1767-1775) and its German successors down to Wolf's *Prolegomena* of 1795. The results are summarized in a ten-page concluding chapter. There is an index, but no bibliography. Although the book is short—only 126 pages of text—the material is even broader than the title suggests; almost as much space is given to German and French critics as to the English.

Foerster devotes almost a third of his space to Blackwell and Wood. It has long been recognized (cf. J. A. Scott, *The Unity of Homer*, p. 41) that nineteenth-century Homeric scholarship, with its hypotheses of multiple authorship and a stratified text, stems directly from Wolf's *Prolegomena*. Foerster's contribution, in this part of his study, is his demonstration of the importance of Blackwell and Wood as precursors and sources for the Wolfian school, which dominated scholarship until the "unitarian" revolt of our own time. Those who look upon the "analytical" school as a nightmare of misplaced energies will be disappointed by Foerster's failure to pass judgment on the value of this tradition, but the facts he presents are interesting and significant.

The chapter on the Scotch critics is less satisfactory. Foerster's account centers on the Ossianic question. But the Scotch were by no means all agreed on this problem, and for some of them it was of very minor significance. Kames and Hume, in particular, are considerably distorted by the attempt to stretch them on this frame.

The standard critics, those whom we think of as representing the main current of thought in the period, are treated in chapters one, two, and five. Foerster's general thesis is a gradual shift throughout the century from "neo-classical" to "historical" methods and standards. Neo-classical criticism, as he conceives it, is "formalistic." It is concerned with the poem itself, as an imitation of unchanging "nature," and its criteria are universal and absolute. Historical criticism is concerned not with the poem but with its biographical and historical setting, and when fully developed its standards are relative and particularistic. An intermediate method, employed by increasing numbers of critics during the eighteenth century, was the "historical approach," a vaguely defined compromise which takes environment into account but is not committed to critical relativism. (These definitions are most clearly developed in the opening and closing chapters, especially pages

1-3 and 114-23; see also pages 26, 30, 37-38, 41, 64, 92, 98, and *passim*.)

This thesis is probably sound, as a rough description of the direction in which critical thought was moving during the period, but a fuller analysis of the major critics would certainly compel some revision of Foerster's definitions. Foerster represents Dryden by one brief quotation and covers Johnson and Hume in a few scattered paragraphs. These critics are all "neo-classical" in grounding their criticism on universal nature. Yet all three admitted and allowed for local and temporary elements in poetry. Dryden, for example, distinguished between the "foundation" of a work of art, which is universal and unchanging, and its "superstructure," which varies with "religion, custom of countries, idioms of languages, etc." ("Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*" [1679], *Essays*, ed. Ker, I, 211). The poet is to imitate changeless nature, but must be allowed to adapt it in outward dress to the circumstances of his own age and nation. This distinction, habitually drawn by Dryden, is developed and systematized by such later critics as Johnson and Hume. Shakespeare and Homer, Johnson says, are great because they adhere to "general nature," only superficially colored by "adventitious peculiarities." But value in poetry is not "absolute and definite, but gradual and comparative." The critic, therefore, must judge a poet in relation to other writers of the same kind, and by comparison of his performance with "the state of the age in which he lived, and with his own particular opportunities" ("Preface to Shakespeare," in *Johnson on Shakespeare*, ed. Raleigh, pp. 9-10, 30-31). On these principles, criticism must be in some sense both relative and historical. In his *Essay on the Standard of Taste*—one of the most brilliant works of philosophical criticism in the language—Hume makes a similar distinction, though expressed of course in terms of his own philosophical scheme. His main contention is the existence of general principles of taste, founded on universal characteristics of human nature. He argues, nevertheless, that rules of criticism must always be relative and probable, rather than absolute and certain, and that they can be applied, in judging particular poems, only to those elements on which human sentiment is agreed. As applied to Homer, these principles permit the critic to condemn the want of humanity and decency sometimes shown by his characters, which is offensive to the principles of universal morality, but they force us at the same time to make allowances both for the "absurdities of pagan theology" and for "innocent peculiarities of manners"—such as princesses drawing water from a spring or kings and heroes dressing their own victuals (*Essays*, ed. Green and Grose, I, 269, 271, 282-84). In Hume, as in Johnson and Dryden, criticism is grounded on universal nature, but is flexible enough to admit historical variations; in none of these critics is the standard an absolute one, or wholly "formalistic." Such critics might be assimilated to Foerster's thesis, but not as he has stated it; they are too supple and subtle for the coarse meshes of his net.

In a book as brief as this one, something had to be sacrificed. Foerster has chosen to focus attention on Blackwell and Wood, schol-

ars or antiquarians rather than literary critics. This emphasis is defensible, but not when a claim is made to completeness and proportion. In spite of their influence on later scholarship, these men are not in any proper sense "the two great English Homeric critics" of the eighteenth century (p. 18 n.; cf. pp. 96 and 117), and a history which makes this assumption is certain to give a distorted picture of the times. The book is, nevertheless, an interesting and competent piece of work. It is careful and thorough, it contains much that is new, and it is well documented and clearly written. Though unsatisfactory as a definitive history of Homeric criticism in the period, it is certainly well above the average among doctoral dissertations.

HOYT TROWBRIDGE

University of Oregon

*The Metaphysical Society: Victorian Minds in Crisis, 1869-1880.* By ALAN WILLARD BROWN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947. Pp. xiv + 372. \$4.50.

The scorn so frequently accorded the Victorian era is fast subsiding as we learn more about that complex period. Its very complexity, we now feel, makes it more nearly akin to our age than is any other epoch. Furthermore, as Professor Alan W. Brown clearly shows in *The Metaphysical Society*, our indebtedness to the Victorians is considerable. The liberal tradition, for instance, owes much to the fostering of a truly critical spirit among a group of Victorian intellectuals.

In earlier times men who shared the same political, religious, or cultural ideas had often formed clubs to promote discussion of their common interests. In the Victorian period the rise of liberalism was marked by the founding of a society to encourage men of diverse views and conflicting creeds to enter into discussion of their different and often irreconcilable opinions. Inaugurated in 1869, the Metaphysical Society was particularly designed to allow free debate between the theists and the growing body of skeptical scientists. The society included men of such widely different points of view as the Catholic Cardinal Manning, the Unitarian James Martineau, several bishops of the Established Church, the agnostic Thomas Huxley, and the anti-Christian James Fitzjames Stephen. For one reason or another Matthew Arnold, Newman, Browning, Mill, and Spencer never became members, but most of the other famous Victorians, including Tennyson, Ruskin, Froude, Gladstone, and Leslie Stephen, were enrolled at some period during the society's eleven years of existence.

At the monthly meetings papers were read on such topics as the nature of causality, miracles, the personality of God, the ethics of belief, and the scientific basis of morals. The subject of the evening was then open to free discussion by the members, who had the gentlemanly ability to argue with each other without rancor. Apparently no one's convictions were shaken, but proselyting was hardly the purpose. As one member later remarked, "the aim of the Society was, by frank and close debate and unreserved communication of dissent

and objections, to attain—not agreement, which was of course beyond hope—but a diminution of mutual misunderstanding.”

The Metaphysical Society was far from being a sterile organization. James Knowles, the founder, was successively editor of the *Contemporary Review* and the *Nineteenth Century*, and various members of the society contributed scores of articles to these magazines. Other members edited or wrote for such periodicals as *Mind*, the *Spectator*, the *Dublin Review*, the *Economist*, *Fraser's*, and *MacMillan's*. Thus the society served as the germinal source for many of the articles that appeared in these widely read magazines. Furthermore, the example of the Metaphysical Society encouraged the founding of two other important organizations, the Aristotelian Society and the Synthetic Society.

Professor Brown observes that the true subject of his book is “faith in discourse,” of which the society is merely a symbol. I think he might better have said that the society is his subject and that faith in free discussion is his theme. In pursuing this theme, he attempts in his penultimate chapter to relate or contrast various trends on the Continent to the growth of English liberalism. As a result he is led into making several generalizations which, because they cannot here be adequately treated, might better have been omitted. The book as a whole, however, is a valuable record of the intellectual conflicts of Victorian England. Using the Metaphysical Society as his focal point, Professor Brown has admirably charted the various cross-currents of the age. At the same time he has shown that men of good will, despite serious disagreements, can keep lighted the lamp of tolerance.

MAURICE J. QUINLAN

*Lehigh University*

*Four Plays by Holberg.* Translated from the Danish by HENRY ALEXANDER. Princeton: Princeton University Press for the American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1946. Pp. x + 202. \$2.50.

Ludvig Holberg, who for nearly two hundred years has been celebrated in Scandinavia as the father of Danish drama and of the Danish theater, has lately been made familiar to American readers through excellent translations of some of his best comedies. The *Four Plays by Holberg*, translated by Henry Alexander, is the second collection from this Danish author to be published in this country by the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

The four plays of the present volume were written between 1722 and 1725, and include such comedies of character as *Den Stundesløse* and *Den Vaegelsindede*. The first of these titles is translated by Mr. Alexander as *The Fussy Man* and the second as *The Weathercock*. The other two plays making up the present collection are *De Usynlige*, translated as *The Masked Ladies*, and *Maskarade* (or *Mascarade*) which has been given the plural form *Masquerades* in the translation.

The introduction to the *Four Plays* is written by Oscar James Campbell, one of the foremost authorities on Holberg in America. Dr. Campbell in his *Comedies of Holberg*, published by the Harvard University Press (1914), classified Holberg's plays (pp. 64-65) as follows: I, "Domestic Comedies of Character"; II, "Simple Comedies of Character"; III, "Comedies of Intrigue"; IV, "Comedies of Manners." He then listed the plays according to their kind under each of these headings. Here we find *Invisible Ladies* (a better translation perhaps than *The Masked Ladies*) listed under "Simple Comedies of Character," while in the introduction to the four plays translated by Alexander The *Masked Ladies* is listed with *Masquerades* as a comedy "of a somewhat different sort." This may perhaps illustrate how difficult it is to make hard and fast classifications. All the elements mentioned above are found in Holberg's comedies, but character and manners are most frequently exploited to give the desired effect. *Masquerades* is classified by Dr. Campbell as a comedy of intrigue; this is undoubtedly the chief element in the play, but even here character and manners are prominent devices.

In regard to the present volume of *Four Plays by Holberg* it might be asked: what justification for translation? In these days when libraries, like jails, are in constant need for expansion to house their contents, close discrimination is required to insure that nothing but the best is given place on the crowded shelves. Mr. Alexander's translation is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Scandinavian drama, and it may be that the deep satiric purpose ever present in Holberg is not entirely pointless in the contemporary American scene. The fussy man, 1947 American model, differs but little from *Den Stundesløse* of eighteenth-century Denmark. Likewise, the capricious Lucretia of *The Weathercock* and the puritanical Jeronimus of *Masquerades* are characters who display weaknesses that are eternal with man. Aside from the timelessness of Holberg's characters, the down-to-earth humor is of the kind that provokes a belly-laugh. What is a better tonic than a good laugh to allay the fears produced by our recent military victory and our superior weapons?

Mr. Alexander's work reads well and, outside some of the titles of the plays, is a very literal translation of the original. A few stilted expressions occur here and there, yet the atmosphere of the original is largely retained. Therefore, to quibble over the choice of this or that idiom is to be guilty of the kind of pedantry against which our "dear Holberg" fought so valiantly.

OSCAR SVARLIEN

University of Florida

*Journal Meiner Reise im Jahre 1769.* By JOHANN GOTTFRIED HERDER.  
Edited by ALEXANDER GILLIES. Oxford: Blackwell, 1947. Pp. xlii  
+ 173. 7/6d.

Professor Gillies' edition of Herder's *Reisejournal*, published in "Blackwell's German Texts," is further evidence of the eminently sound approach to Germanic studies which prevails in England today.



With its admirable introduction and scholarly notes, the work is presented in a form useful both to the capable undergraduate and to the more advanced student. Instead of learning the usual generalizations about Herder, the beginner is led directly to read one of the most fascinating and important of his works. And there can be few students so well-versed in the eighteenth century that they will not profit by Gillies' notes on the numerous references, often to rather obscure German and French figures, which occur in the journal.

The introduction is a masterly performance, concentrating a great amount of material into a relatively small space. Gillies describes briefly the restless, ambitious personality of the youthful Herder; the political and social situation in Livonia; the impact of the sea on Herder's imagination; and his bitterly hostile attitude towards contemporary French civilization. This last he holds, rightly I think, to have been "determined fundamentally by a sense of inferiority at not possessing those qualities he attacks so bitterly." He includes also an interpretative sketch of Herder's proposals for educational reform. Gillies writes from a very definite and individual point of view. Although he stresses the brilliance and significance of the *Journal meiner Reise*, he does not hesitate to point out what seem to him deficiencies in Herder's personality and thought. He admits frankly, for instance, Herder's weakness in denying the authorship of certain early works; and he describes a letter of 1770 as "oozing pride and egoism." Like other British Germanists, he has found an Archimedean point from which to survey German culture: his view is national (but not nationalistic), clear, and remarkably objective. By no means afraid to generalize, he avoids completely the pseudoprofundity and willful obscurity that characterize so much of recent *Geisteswissenschaft*. One or two statements seem too sweeping: that there is no word in the *Reisejournal* which does not have a parallel in the *Urfaust*; or that Herder "tortured himself in the *Reisejournal* to such little purpose." This work does after all contain early formulations of most or all of Herder's cardinal ideas—purpose and achievement enough for a diary of travel.

The text follows Suphan, with modernization of the spelling but preservation of various peculiarities of grammar and diction. Unfortunately, there are many misprints; I noted the following: "Abund" (p. xi); "Schattenfabal" (p. xxxvi); "Greichen" (p. 16); "Auschauens" (p. 34); "jeine" (p. 40); "Theologie" for "Theologe" (p. 43); "Richts" (p. 77); "füsse" (p. 77); "Urteiel" (p. 85); "praetor propter" (p. 88); and "ger" (p. 90). An index of names and a brief index of references to Herder's works and plans close the book. The latter is of especial value pedagogically.

Professor Gillies and Professor James Boyd, the general editor of "Blackwell's German Texts," are both to be congratulated.

HENRY C. HATFIELD

Columbia University



*Brentano's Novellen*. By JACQUELIN A. MACNAUGHTON. New York: New York University, Washington Square College, 1946. Pp. 20.

It is difficult to tell from an abridgment what a dissertation may have proved. All that can be discerned is the author's intention, here expressed in the summary of the introduction: "to evaluate Brentano's *Novellen*, only two of which are well-known, and to prepare the way for an acceptance of Brentano's rightful place in German Literature as the author of this type of narrative."

Part II, according to the table of contents, deals with contents and essential facts, biographical and literary background, and sources. Part III, dealing with style and form, takes into account: under A, the *Novelle*; under B, analytical technique, motivation, and suspense; under D, language and expression; and under E, evaluation and criticism.

The abridgment takes up C, Peculiarities of Style, and presents the thesis that Brentano, though he had his own peculiarities of style, followed the technical devices of the Romantic school in the use of the *Rahmengeschichte*, the *Icherzählung*, the insertion of reports, inclusion of verse, and archaic speech. There appears to be nothing new or startling in this, and it is not made clear just how Brentano differed from the general pattern, unless it is tacit in the ability to make his *Novellen* gripping, to convey the feeling of heightened suspense, and in his general skill.

The conclusion of the abridgment takes the view that "there has been no real study of Brentano to present a true picture of him" and asserts that most critics know only the *Chronika* and *Kasperl*, without considering the others worth mentioning. The thesis includes, in addition, the *Wehmüller*, the *Drei Nüsse*, and—of particular interest to students of the Romantic movement—the *Schachtel mit der Friedenspuppe*, which "was not known until recently." (This appeared in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* in 1922; it is a pity that it is not more readily available.)

Whatever the execution, the aims of this inquiry are admirable. There is a real paucity of Brentano research along literary lines, as is demonstrated by the exceedingly slim bibliography appended to the abridgment. Brentano's spectacular religious experiences have overshadowed his art for too long, and his whimsicalities deserve something more than disparagement or ridicule.

LYDIA BAER

Swarthmore College

*Linguistics and Literary History: Essays in Stylistics*. By LEO SPITZER. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1948. Pp. iv + 236. \$3.75.

The title that Professor Spitzer gave to this volume of essays is significant of the great change that has taken place in linguistic scholarship; and it is especially significant for those of us who began the serious study of linguistics shortly after the turn of the century. The

philologists of the preceding generation, adopting the scientific method that was being used so effectively in the natural sciences, had patiently collected, examined, and catalogued the phenomena of speech-sounds, and had formulated the phonetic laws underlying the evolution of such sounds. As for the many exceptions they generally brushed them aside as sporadic sound-shifts. This indifference to exceptional word-development and national peculiarities of speech produced a reaction in the younger philologists. Under the guidance of Meyer-Lübke, whose grammars and dictionaries were to become standard reference books for this second generation of language students, they accepted as basic material the phonological contributions of the older scholars, and then proceeded to remedy the latter's failure to recognize the psychological nature of linguistic change and the importance of analogy and semantics.

Much more radical are the changes that have been brought about in recent years by the so-called Idealistic and Esthetic philologists. Differing somewhat in aims and methods, they are agreed on essential principles: the history of the language of a people is an integral part of their cultural history; the barrier that formerly separated linguistics and literary history does not really exist; the scientific method has many limitations in a discipline such as linguistics in which human vagaries and outside influences have to be continually taken into account; the purely scientific objective of the earlier, positivist philologists must be abandoned if linguistic study is to serve as a subsidiary of the history of a nation's literature and culture.

One of the most vigorous and versatile of this new school of idealistic and esthetic philologists is the author of the book under review, Leo Spitzer, formerly associated with several European universities, now professor of Romance philology at Johns Hopkins.

Professor Spitzer begins the first of the five essays "Linguistics and Literary History," by telling us why he, a student first of the classics and then of Romance languages and literatures, became dissatisfied with the positivistic methods of philologists who tried to explain the phenomena of sound-changes in language without due regard for cultural influences, and of literary historians who gave much more attention to factual information than to the idealistic and esthetic values of the literature itself. Particularly irksome did he find the general assumption that linguistics and literary criticism were entirely separate disciplines. He asked himself the question: "Since the best document of the soul of a nation is its literature, and since the latter is nothing but its language as this is written down by elect speakers, can we perhaps not hope to grasp the spirit of a nation in the language of its outstanding works of literature" (p. 10). As for the individual writer, could he not be better understood by a rigorously scientific definition of his style, "the definition of a linguist which should replace the casual, impressionistic remarks of literary critics. Stylistics, I thought, might bridge the gap between linguistics and literary history" (p. 11). The rest of the essay is taken up mainly with illustrations of his procedure.

In the four following essays he applies to various authors of different nations and periods the principle of the philological circle, "the

to-and-fro voyage from certain outward details to the inner center and back again to other series of details . . ." (p. 19).

In "Linguistic Perspectivism in the *Don Quijote*" he considers, with many illustrative details, the instability and variety of the names given by Cervantes to his characters; from this linguistic perspectivism he passes to the relativistic conception of life that informs the novel as a whole.

Beyond this perspectivism, we may sense the presence of something which is not subject to fluctuation: the immovable, immutable principle of the divine—which, perhaps, to some extent, is reflected in the earthly *artifex* himself: the novelist who assumes a near-divine power in his mastery of the material, in his own unshaken attitude toward the phenomena of his world (and even in his aloofness from the reader). And it is in this glorification of the artist that the main historical significance of the Spanish masterpiece is to be seen (p. 41).

The real hero of the novel is not Don Quijote; it is Cervantes himself, "the artist . . . who combines a critical and illusionistic art according to his free will. From the moment we open the book to the moment we put it down, we are given to understand that an almighty overlord is directing us, who leads us where he pleases" (p. 69).

In the next essay, "The 'Récit de Théramène,'" Professor Spitzer varies his usual procedure by first seeking to establish the meaning of the whole tragedy (Racine's *Phèdre*) before giving consideration to the linguistic details of the *récit* itself. The concluding words of the essay suggest the proper procedure for the study of any literary masterpiece.

We have . . . tried to show that former critics have failed to let themselves be guided by the words of the play toward its inner economy and coherence, preferring rather to establish relationships between certain unrelated details of the play and aprioristic criteria extraneous to the play. Since we have chosen to remain within the play, our procedure has been to penetrate from the periphery of the words to the inner core. For the words of the poet are shafts leading to the innermost part of the mine, while extraneous rapprochements are dead alleys. Criticism must remain immanent to the work of art, and draw its categories therefrom (p. 125).

In "The Style of Diderot" the attempt is made, through the study of his literary style, to penetrate to the soul not only of the author, but of the man himself. His mental and emotional frustration, due to the interminable conflict between his natural tendency toward extreme sensitivity and the rationalism of his time, is apparent everywhere in his manner of writing, a style that frequently becomes feverish and staccato and that has habitually a self-accentuating rhythm that is anything but classic. It reflects the natural mobility of thought and feeling that Diderot tried in vain to conceal behind an intellectual attitude toward reality; also the erotic obsession that motivated much of his writing.

The purpose of the last essay, "Interpretation of an Ode by Paul Claudel," may be found in the first and last sentences of the first paragraph: "One stanza . . . from one poem, *La Muse qui est la Grâce*, belonging to a series of six *Grandes Odes*, is singled out from the whole work of Claudel for stylistic interpretation—a stanza of

unusual length (covering several pages) in which the author seems to set forth the purpose of the ode(s), and which, at first sight, appears oppressively dense and opaque" (p. 193); "Whereas a literary historian, interested in his categories, may easily speak of 'Christian vs. pagan poetry,' this *versus*, the sign of a historical struggle of cultures, is reenacted in Claudel's soul and is embodied in the linguistic form of the poem" (p. 194).

The thorough training that Spitzer received as a pupil of Meyer-Lübke and his respect for traditional scholarship have kept him free from the charges of superficiality, slovenly thinking, and eccentricity that have been leveled at some of the adherents of the idealistic and esthetic school. Some readers may find his reasoning eccentric, but this is probably due to the frequent ellipses in his style; his active mind leaps readily from point to point without need of the bridge that his slower reader may find necessary. Some may object to what they consider arbitrary definitions. By "method," for example, he means a "habitual procedure of the mind," rather than a "program regulating beforehand a series of operations . . . in view of reaching a well-defined result" (p. 38, n. 17). And when he refers to his new method of studying literature as "scientific," he is thinking not of the scientists of a generation ago, but of those who today supplement observation with imagination and even intuition. His encyclopedic knowledge of many languages and literatures, overflowing into many pages of notes, may be overwhelming for some readers; others will be stimulated by it and by his ready use of technical or rare words and his facile creation of new words when needed.

The essays are interesting not only for the light they throw on the new approach to literary criticism, but also as penetrating studies of four great writers.

GEORGE W. UMPHREY

*University of Washington*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

### AMERICAN

Spiller, Robert E., Willard Thorp, Thomas H. Johnson, Henry Seidel Canby, *et al.* (editors). *Literary History of the United States*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1948. 3 volumes. I, xx + 636; II, 639-1422; III, Bibliography, xxii + 817. \$20, boxed set.

Stewart, Randall. *Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography*. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1948. Pp. 279. \$4.00.

### ENGLISH

Allott, Kenneth (editor). *The Poems of William Habington*. London: University Press of Liverpool, 1948. Pp. lxxviii + 208. 15s.

Borst, William A. *Lord Byron's First Pilgrimage*. New Haven: Yale University Studies in English, Vol. 109; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1948. Pp. xxiv + 176. \$3.75.

- Brown, Wallace Cable. *The Triumph of Form: A Study of the Later Masters of the Heroic Couplet*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948. Pp. viii + 212. \$3.50.
- Cordasco, Francesco. *Laurence Sterne: A List of Critical Studies Published from 1896 to 1946*. Brooklyn: Long Island University, Eighteenth Century Bibliographical Pamphlets, No. 4, 1948. Pp. 13. \$1.00.
- Davenport, A. (editor). *Faunus and Melliflora (1600) by John Weever*. London: University Press of Liverpool, Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1948. Pp. viii + 85. 5/-.
- English Institute Essays, 1947. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. x + 202. \$2.50.
- Fuson, Benjamin Willis. *Browning and His English Predecessors in the Dramatic Monolog*. Iowa City: State University of Iowa, Humanistic Studies, Vol. VIII, No. 418, 1948. Pp. 96. \$1.25.
- Loomis, Roger Sherman. *Introduction to Medieval Literature Chiefly in England: A Reading List and Bibliography*. Second edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. 32. \$0.60.
- Lumiansky, R. M. (translator). *The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer. A New Modern Prose Translation. Together with the Original Middle English Text of the General Prologue and the Nun's Priest's Tale*. Preface by Mark Van Doren and Illustrations by H. Lawrence Hoffman. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1948. Pp. xxix + 345. \$2.95.
- McManaway, James G., Giles E. Dawson, and Edwin E. Willoughby (editors). *Joseph Quincy Adams: Memorial Studies*. Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948. Pp. x + 808. \$10.
- Miles, Josephine. *The Primary Language of Poetry in the 1640's*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in English, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1948. Pp. 1-160. \$2.50.
- Moore, Robert Etheridge. *Hogarth's Literary Relationships*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London, Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1948. Pp. viii + 202. \$3.75.
- Payne, William L. *Index to Defoe's Review*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. x + 144. \$4.00.
- Smith, John Harrington. *The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948. Pp. xi + 252. \$3.50.
- Wimsatt, W. K., Jr. *Philosophic Words: A Study of Style and Meaning in the Rambler and Dictionary of Samuel Johnson*. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1948. Pp. xvi + 167. \$3.75.

## FRENCH

- Dieckmann, Herbert. *Le Philosophe: Texts and Interpretation*. Saint Louis: Washington University Studies, New Series, Language and Literature, No. 18, 1948. Pp. ix + 108.
- Hall, Robert A., Jr. *Language Monograph No. 24, Structural Sketches I, French*. Baltimore: Supplement to *Language*, Journal of the Linguistic Society of America, Vol. 24, No. 3, July-September, 1948. Pp. 56.
- Laughlin, Sister Mary Frances. *The Rethorica Nova Attributed to Jacobus Izelgrinus*, Edited from MS. 441 of the Public Library at Bruges, with Excerpts from the *Tractatus de Coloribus Rethoricis* Preserved in the Same Manuscript. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Pp. xlvii + 52.

- Macy, Pierre, and Henry A. Grubbs. *Petits Contes Humoristiques*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1948. Pp. viii + 170. \$2.65.
- May, Georges. *Tragédie Cornélienne, Tragédie Racinienne: Etude sur les sources de l'intérêt dramatique*. Urbana: University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XXXII, No. 4, 1948. Pp. 255. \$2.50, paper; \$3.50, cloth.
- O'Brien, Justin (editor). *The Maxims of Marcel Proust*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. xxiv + 235. \$3.00.
- Pei, Mario A. *French Precursors of the Chanson de Roland*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. xiv + 105. \$3.00.
- Picasso, Pablo. *Desire. A Play*. Translated from the French by Bernard Frechtman. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948. Pp. 63. \$2.75.
- Secor, Walter Todd. *Paul Bourget and the Nouvelle*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1948. Pp. xi + 256. \$3.00.

## GERMAN

- Novalis. *Hymns to the Night*. Translated by Mabel Cotterell. With an Introduction and Appreciation by August Closs. London: Phoenix Press, 1948. Pp. 60. 7/6.
- Oechler, William F. *Motivation in the Drama of Friedrich Hebbel*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1948. Pp. viii + 199. \$2.50.

## ITALIAN

- Bergin, Thomas Goddard, and Max Harold Fisch (translators). *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*. Translated from the Third Edition (1744). Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1948. Pp. xv + 398. \$5.00.

## SPANISH

- Berkowitz, H. Chonon. *Perez Galdos, Spanish Liberal Crusader*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1948. Pp. xi + 499. \$6.00.

## GENERAL

- Cassirer, Ernst, Paul Oskar Kristeller, and John Herman Randall, Jr. (editors). *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948. Pp. viii + 405. \$5.00.
- Connolly, Cyril. *Enemies of Promise*. Revised edition. New York: Macmillan Company, 1948. Pp. xii + 265. \$4.00.
- Ferguson, Wallace K. *The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1948. Pp. xiii + 429. \$5.00.
- Froeschels, Emil. *Philosophy in Wit*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948. Pp. xiii + 61. \$2.75.
- Loomis, C. Grant. *White Magic: An Introduction to the Folklore of Christian Legend*. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1948. Pp. vii + 250. \$5.00; to members of the Academy, \$4.00.
- Mueller, Gustav E. *Philosophy of Literature*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948. Pp. 226. \$3.50.
- Wilson, Richard Albert. *The Miraculous Birth of Language*. Preface by George Bernard Shaw. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948. Pp. 256. \$3.75.

# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

---

VOLUME NINE, 1948

---

Edited by  
EDWARD GODFREY COX  
*Managing Editor*

DUDLEY D. GRIFFITH

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

GEORGE W. UMPHREY

*Direct Contributions and Business Correspondence to*  
Managing Editor, Modern Language Quarterly  
Parrington Hall  
University of Washington  
Seattle 5

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS  
SEATTLE 5, WASHINGTON





# MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

VOLUME IX—1948

## CONTENTS

George Leonard Barnett. A Critical Analysis of the Lucas Edition of Lamb's Letters .....	303
William Blackburn. Bishop Butler and the Design of Arnold's <i>Literature and Dogma</i> .....	199
Ernest Boll. A Rationale for the Criticism of the Realistic Novel .....	208
Donald F. Brown. The Catholic Naturalism of Manuel Gálvez .....	165
Rufus A. Coleman. Trowbridge and Clemens .....	216
Francesco Cordasco. Smollett and Petronius .....	415
Jean David. Voltaire et les Indiens d'Amérique .....	90
Scott Elledge. Cowley's Ode "Of Wit" and Longinus on the Sublime: A Study of One Definition of the Word "Wit" .....	185
William Elton. <i>Paradise Lost</i> and the Digby <i>Mary Magdalene</i> .....	412
Clark Emery. John Wilkins and Noah's Ark .....	286
G. Blakemore Evans. Some More Hobson Verses .....	10
———. A Correction to "Some More Hobson Verses" .....	184
Willa McClung Evans. Tormenting Fires .....	11
William B. Hunter, Jr. Prophetic Dreams and Visions in <i>Paradise Lost</i> .....	277
Bernard F. Huppé. Walter Pater on Plato's Aesthetics .....	315
Claude E. Jones. Poetry and the <i>Critical Review</i> , 1756-1785 .....	17
Hoover H. Jordan. Byron and Moore .....	429
B. R. McElderry, Jr. Coleridge on Blake's <i>Songs</i> .....	298
Don A. McKenzie. Otfridiana: Some Comments on Otfrid's "Style" .....	131
Paul E. McLane. Piers of Spenser's <i>Shepherd's Calendar</i> : Dr. John Piers of Salisbury .....	3
Hans Albert Maier. Die Stellung des "Doktor Faustus" im Gesamtwerke Thomas Manns .....	343
E. L. Marilla. The Secular and Religious Poetry of Henry Vaughan .....	394
Georges May. La Genèse de <i>Bajazet</i> .....	152
A. Laurence Muir. Some Observations on the Early English Psalters and the English Vocabulary .....	273
Walter Naumann. The Architecture of George Eliot's Novels .....	37
John J. Parry. A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1947 .....	224

Thomas A. Perry. Emerson, the Historical Frame, and Shakespeare .....	440
Carroll E. Reed. A Survey of Pennsylvania German Morphology .....	322
——— and Lester W. Seifert. A Study of the Pennsylvania German Dialect Spoken in the Counties of Lehigh and Berks .....	448
Walter A. Reichart. The Genesis of Hauptmann's Iphigenia Cycle .....	467
Irving Ribner. Bolingbroke, a True Machiavellian .....	177
Detlev W. Schumann. Neuorientierung im achtzehnten Jahrhundert: Ein Vortrag .....	54, 135
G. P. Shannon. Against Marot as a Source of Marlowe's <i>Hero and Leander</i> .....	387
Leo Spitzer. Patterns of Thought in the Style of Albert Thibaudet .....	259, 478
S. D. Stirk. Gerhart Hauptmann's Play "Die Finsternisse" .....	146
Edward D. Sullivan. The Actor's Alceste: Evolution of the Misanthrope .....	74
———. Molé's Interpretation of Molière's Misanthrope .....	492
James Thorpe. Keats's "Hymn to Pan" and the Litany .....	424
Harry Tucker, Jr. F. L. zu Stolberg: "Der Felsenstrom": Eine Interpretierung .....	51
Alberta Turner. Another Seventeenth-Century Anglo-Saxon Poem .....	389
Henry H. Wasser. Notes on the <i>Visions of the Daughters of Albion</i> by William Blake .....	292
Stewart C. Wilcox. Hazlitt's Aphorisms .....	418

## REVIEWS

Jean Matthieu Marie Aler. In Spiegel der Form: Stilkritische wege zur deutung von Stefan Georges Maximindichtung [ <i>August Closs</i> ] .....	118
Henry Alexander (translator). Four Plays by Holberg [ <i>Oscar Svarlien</i> ] .....	504
Don Cameron Allen (editor). Essays by Sir William Cornwallis the Younger [ <i>Alfred Harbage</i> ] .....	107
"Altdeutsche Übungstexte" [ <i>Carroll E. Reed</i> ] .....	238
Charles R. Anderson (general editor). Sidney Lanier: Centennial Edition [ <i>E. Harold Eby</i> ] .....	253
M. L. Barker and H. Homeyer. The Pocket Oxford German Dictionary [ <i>Carroll E. Reed</i> ] .....	121
Clair Hayden Bell. Georg Hager: A Meistersinger of Nürnberg, 1552-1634 [ <i>Bayard Q. Morgan</i> ] .....	115
Steen Steensen Blicher. Twelve Stories [ <i>Sophus K. Winther</i> ] ..	115
Bertolt Brecht. The Private Life of the Master Race [ <i>Günther Keil</i> ] .....	119

Alan Willard Brown. The Metaphysical Society: Victorian Minds in Crisis, 1869-1880 [ <i>Maurice J. Quinlan</i> ]	503
Douglas Bush. English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660 [ <i>Rudolf Kirk</i> ]	108
E. K. Chambers. Sources for a Biography of Shakespeare [ <i>James G. McManaway</i> ]	106
James L. Clifford (editor). Dr. Campbell's Diary of a Visit to England in 1775 [ <i>Richard D. Altick</i> ]	368
August Closs. Die freien Rhythmen in der deutschen Lyrik [ <i>Harvey W. Hewett-Thayer</i> ]	379
Hardin Craig (editor). Machiavelli's <i>The Prince</i> : An Elizabethan Translation [ <i>Angelo M. Pellegrini</i> ]	105
Myles Dillon. The Cycles of the Kings [ <i>Roland M. Smith</i> ]	243
Donald M. Foerster. Homer in English Criticism [ <i>Hoyt Trowbridge</i> ]	501
Northrop Frye. Fearful Symmetry: A Study of William Blake [ <i>Henry Wasser</i> ]	248
Alexander Gillies (editor). Journal Meiner Reise im Jahre 1769 by Johann Gottfried Herder [ <i>Henry C. Hatfield</i> ]	505
Harley Granville-Barker. Prefaces to Shakespeare, Volume I [ <i>H. T. Price</i> ]	357
Albert Grenier. Camille Jullian: Un demi-siècle de science historique et de progrès français, 1880-1930 [ <i>Jean David</i> ]	242
Margaret R. Grennan. William Morris, Medievalist and Revolutionary [ <i>Karl Litzenberg</i> ]	110
Marvin T. Herrick. Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism [ <i>H. T. Swedenberg, Jr.</i> ]	355
Edwin Johnston Howard (editor). Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man, by Sir Thomas Elyot [ <i>John Leon Lievsay</i> ]	245
Merritt Y. Hughes (editor). John Milton: Prose Selections [ <i>Edward S. Le Comte</i> ]	361
Wolfgang Kayser. Kleine Deutsch Versschule [ <i>August Closs</i> ]	117
Laura Keeler. Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Late Latin Chroniclers, 1300-1500 [ <i>John J. Parry</i> ]	104
Victor Lange. Modern German Literature, 1870-1940 [ <i>André von Gronicka</i> ]	122
Henry Goddard Leach (editor). A Pageant of Old Scandinavia [ <i>A. LeRoy Andrews</i> ]	371
Babette May Levy. Preaching in the First Half of New England Church History [ <i>Helen C. White</i> ]	250
Frank Whiteman Lindsay. Dramatic Parody by Marionettes in 18th Century Paris [ <i>Glenn Hughes</i> ]	124
Solomon Liptzin. Germany's Stepchildren [ <i>Günther Keil</i> ]	378
Jacquelin A. MacNaughton. Brentano's Novellen [ <i>Lydia Baer</i> ]	507

Christian F. Melz. An Evaluation of the Earliest German Translation of <i>Don Quixote</i> [Lienhard Bergel].....	239
Bruce Archer Morrisette. The Life and Works of Marie-Catherine Desjardins (Mme de Villegieu), 1632-1683 [Frederick King Turgeon] .....	125
Richard D. Mosier. Making the American Mind [Floyd Stovall] .....	370
Helen Meredith Mustard. The Lyric Cycle in German Literature [Lydia Baer] .....	373
Mary Patchell. The Palmerin Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction [Francis Lee Utley].....	497
William Lytton Payne. Mr. Review [Oscar Sherwin].....	363
F. E. L. Priestley (editor). William Godwin: Enquiry concerning Political Justice [Elizabeth Nitchie].....	365
William Peirce Randel. Edward Eggleston, Author of the Hoosier School-Master [Benjamin T. Spencer].....	251
Gordon N. Ray (editor). The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray [Sophus K. Winther].....	249
Aleyn Lyell Reade. Johnsonian Gleanings: Part X, Johnson's Early Life, The Final Narrative [Bertrand H. Bronson].....	247
F. H. Reinsch. The Correspondence of Johann Caspar Goethe [J. Alan Pfeffer] .....	375
Edith Amelie Runge. Primitivism and Related Ideas in <i>Sturm und Drang</i> Literature [Stuart Atkins].....	376
Trusten Wheeler Russell. Voltaire, Dryden and Heroic Tragedy [Baxter Hathaway] .....	241
Saintsbury Miscellany [Dorothy Richardson].....	112
Horatio Smith (editor). Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature [Edward G. Cox].....	354
Leo Spitzer. Linguistics and Literary History [George W. Umphrey] .....	507
Alfred McKinley Terhune. Life of Edward FitzGerald [Lionel Stevenson] .....	366
E. M. W. Tillyard. Shakespeare's History Plays [Virgil K. Whitaker] .....	498
Anthony Trollope. An Autobiography [Harold H. Scudder].....	369
Rosemond Tuve. Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery [George R. Potter] .....	359
Howard P. Vincent (editor). Collected Poems of Herman Melville [R. E. Watters].....	113
Lawrence B. Wallis. Fletcher, Beaumont & Company [G. F. Sensabaugh] .....	246
Katherine Kirtley Weed and Richmond Pugh Bond. Studies of British Newspapers and Periodicals from Their Beginnings to 1800 [John Robert Moore].....	110















